

Arch

nce
ndred
life-
endid
span
ly in
arity,
book
ntury
enty-
have
logy

modern language notes

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

VOL. LXXII, NO. 3, MARCH 1957

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

APR 10 1957

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

- NY
TA 3
- 161 A Note on Structure in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.
DALE B. J. RANDALL
- 164 Chaucer's Method of Composition. CHARLES A. OWEN, JR.
- 165 The Date of *Mandeville's Travels*. J. D. THOMAS
- 169 More and Lucian. JOHN CROSSETT
- 170 The Title of Nash's *Pierce Penniless*. NIEL K. SNORTUM
- 174 The Prosody of Milton's *Epitaph, L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*.
MICHAEL F. MOLONEY
- 178 Steele, The Junto and *The Tatler* No. 4. CALHOUN WINTON
- 182 A James "Gift" to Edith Wharton. MILLICENT BELL
- 185 The Reflection of Poe in Conrad Aiken's "Strange Moonlight."
SEYMOUR L. GROSS
- 189 Old Provençal *Desmentir sos pairis*. KURT LEWENT
- 194 'Un temple sacré': A Note on Racine's *Phèdre*. P. J. YARROW
- 199 Premiers exemples de l'emploi du terme *Renaissance*.
MARCEL FRANÇON
- 200 Zur Textkritik von Kleists *Der zerbrochene Krug*. ALBERT SCHOLZ

REVIEWS

- 202 RENÉ WELLEK, *A History of Modern Criticism, Vol. I, The Later 18th Century, Vol. II, The Romantic Age* (A. GILLIES)
- 204 RANDOLPH QUIRK and C. L. WRENN, *An Old English Grammar* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 206 BEDE, *A History of the English Church and People*, tr. LEO SHERLEY-PRICE (ALLAN H. ORRICK)
- 207 HARDIN CRAIG, *English Religious Drama of the Middle Ages* (ALBERT C. BAUGH)
- 210 DUDLEY DAVID GRIFFITH, *Bibliography of Chaucer 1908-1953* (HOWARD R. PATCH)
- 212 HENRY LYTTLETON SAVAGE, *The "Gawain"-Poet: Studies in His Personality and Background* (THOMAS A. KIRBY)
- 214 SAMUEL SCHOENBAUM, *Middleton's Tragedies, A Critical Study* (HAROLD JENKINS)
- 218 CLAY HUNT, *Donne's Poetry: Essays in Literary Analysis* (ARNOLD STEIN)
- 221 ROBERT WENTWORTH ROGERS, *The Major Satires of Alexander Pope* (AUBREY L. WILLIAMS)
- 222 R. P. PARKIN, *The Poetic Workmanship of Alexander Pope* (REUBEN A. BROWER)
- 225 HELEN GILL VILJOEN, *Ruskin's Scottish Heritage: A Prelude* (S. O. A. ULLMANN)
- 228 G. TURVILLE-PETRE, *Origins of Icelandic Literature* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 231 HIERONYMUS EMSER, *Eyn deutsche satyta*, ed. ROBERT T. CLARK, JR. (THOMAS PERRY THORNTON)
- 233 WERNER KOHLSCHMIDT, *Form und Innerlichkeit* (BRUCE HAYWOOD)
- 235 WILLIAM ROSE, *Heinrich Heine. Two Studies of his Thought and Feeling* (ERNST FEHR)
- 236 MARIA BINDSCHIEDLER, *Nietzsche und die poetische Lüge* (ANDREW O. JASZI)
- 239 DANIEL C. VON LOHENSTEIN, *Türkische Trauerspiele*, ed. KLAUS G. JUST (G. SCHULZ-BEHREND)

modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,
General Editor
DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
CLIFTON C. CHERPACK
STEFÁN EINARSSON
RICHARD H. GREEN
THOMAS R. HART, JR.
ANNA G. HATCHER
WILLIAM H. McCLAIN
J. HILLIS MILLER
GEORGES POULET
KARL L. SELIG
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md. Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress of 16 July 1894.

ol. II,

Back-

(AMS)

(EIS)

through
; \$6.25
\$, \$1.00
should
8, Md
descrip
s, The
Every
return
ors are

e, Md
rate o
ngrea

II,

n
L
n

A
S

for
K
al
co
h
th
st

in
5
n.
d
i.
as
e
y
m
e

..
f
.

v

modern language notes

VOL. LXXII, NO. 3, MARCH 1957

A Note on Structure in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*

Literature is assuredly not geometry, yet the reader who disregards form in such a highly-patterned work as *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is missing one of the significant pleasures of reading. Probably nobody today would regard this particular romance as merely colorfully written and not carefully conceived, but I believe no one has yet indicated the striking balance of its structure. I should therefore like to present a brief schematic outline of some of the story's elements.

Frame	{ "Sipen þe sege and þe assault . . ."
	{ Brutus
	{ Arthur's court
	Challenge made (New Year's Day)
	Ride to seek chapel
	Evening festivities
	Hunt #1, pt. a
	Giving of kiss
	Hunt #1, pt. b
	Payment of kiss

Evening festivities
 Hunt #2, pt. a
 Giving of 2 kisses
 Hunt #2, pt. b
 Payment of 2 kisses
 Evening festivities
 Hunt #3, pt. a
 Giving of 3 kisses
 Hunt #3, pt. b
 Payment of 3 kisses
 Evening festivities
 Ride to seek chapel
 Challenge fulfilled (New Year's Day)

Frame { Arthur's court
 Brutus
 " After þe segge and þe asaute . . ." ¹

It may be seen from this that the poet begins his story by introducing three diverse but related elements, all of which he presents again in exactly inverted order at the conclusion of his work. Then, after this initial appearance of what we may call his frame, he proceeds to the Green Knight's challenge, the fulfillment of which is narrated just before the end of the story, that is, just before the second and final presentation of the frame. After receiving the challenge, Sir Gawain rides out to seek the chapel, and just before the fulfillment he goes forth once again on the same quest. Between these two journeys, moreover, there is a rhythmic recurrence of other story elements. The narration of the evening festivities, the hunting trips, and the matter relevant to the kisses is several times represented, each time varied in suggestive ways by the artistry of the poet. Of particular interest is the way in which suspense is built by breaking each hunting episode into two parts which are placed on either side of an episode that occurs back at the castle, thus giving each major subdivision of this central portion of the romance an inner and wave-like dynamic of its own. Even the pattern of the Green Knight's metamorphoses is regular; at the beginning and ending he is the fiendish challenger, but in the central portion he is the genial host.²

¹ The opening line of the poem is "Sipen þe sege and þe assaut watȝ sesed at Troye," and the last line (save for the final "bob-wheel") is "After þe segge and þe asaute watȝ sesed at Troye." These appear, respectively, on p. 1 and p. 78 of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1952).

² It might also be noted that Gawain goes to the castle chapel on each of

Apart from the amount of regularity given the story by this sort of organization and by the fact that it is cast in verse, one might also ponder whether the form of the entire work reflects in large the technique by which the author of *Pearl* contrived to end his stanzas as he began them. In *Pearl* we find verses linked as neatly as the ringlets in a byrnie, stanzas which begin, for example, "As John þe apostel hit sy3 wyth sy3t," and which end, "As derely deuysez þis ilk toun/ In Apocalyppez þe apostel John,"³ or "Of sunne ne mone had þay no nede" and "Watz bry3ter þen boþe þe sunne and mone."⁴ Since we find a similar device in the over-all structure of the Arthurian romance, perhaps this is a small but new reason for suspecting that the *Gawain*-poet and the *Pearl*-poet are one.

Rich, bright, and unrealistic as it is, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* emerges no less beautiful from an analysis such as this than does such a work as Jan Van Eyck's carefully balanced and brilliant Dresden triptych. At the same time, however, I do not advance it as a substitute for other approaches. Like any other, this method may be pushed too far, especially since the design of the story as a whole is less like that which is formed with a compass and protractor than that which is assumed by iron particles when a magnet—in this case the artist's creative impulse as modified by his milieu—is placed beneath the paper where they lie. For this reason if for no other the schematic approach ought to be utilized cautiously and together with such other tools as will enable one to penetrate related matters like symbol and theme. Used thus it will provide readers with additional grounds for maintaining that *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is the work of a highly conscious and competent artist.

University of Pennsylvania

DALE B. J. RANDALL

the mornings after he rises. This and other similar matters might be adduced to indicate an even more complex organization than I have presented in the outline.

³ E. V. Gordon, ed. *Pearl* (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 36, l. 985 and ll. 995-6.

⁴ Gordon, p. 38, ll. 1045, 1056.

Chaucer's Method of Composition

Professor Root's description of the actual writing of *Troilus and Criseyde* is as follows (Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, Princeton, 1945, p. lxxvii):

The poet's own draft of his poem, confused, it would seem, on many a page by erasures and interlineations, was turned over to a professional scribe, who made from it a fair copy. This copy contained not only the errors which are inevitable in the work of transcription, but others which arose from Adam's failure to understand here and there his employer's final intention, obscured as it was by a tangle of rewritings and blotted lines. When the poet had "proof-read" this copy, correcting all of Adam's errors which caught his attention, it became what we may call his own "official" text, from which new copies were made for presentation to friends and patrons. In this official text, the poet also made from time to time other alterations dictated by his own exacting poetic instinct—the addition of new passages, the rearrangement of other passages, the new turning of a phrase, the substitution of what seemed to him a happier word, the metrical revision of a halting line.

A rather startling confirmation of Professor Root's inferences about Chaucer's own draft has since appeared in the manuscript of *The Equatorie of the Planetis* (edited by Derek Price, Cambridge, 1955), which there seems no reason for not accepting as Chaucer's own first draft. In this manuscript are to be found the erasures, interlineations, the tangle of rewritings and blotted lines, postulated by Professor Root, plus two extended passages which Chaucer canceled with the notation "this canon is fals" and with some diagonal lines, both of which a careless scribe might have ignored.

Some further inferences can, I think, be drawn as to Chaucer's procedure in *Troilus and Criseyde*. Professor Root accounted for the absence of the Proems to Books II, III, and IV in the Rawlinson manuscript, which presents in other respects the final version of the text, by assuming "that they had been lost from the original before R was derived; and such an explanation implies that in the original they had been added later on loose leaves" (p. xii). However, the Proem to Book IV, which envisages a poem in four books rather than five, must have been written before the whole work was finished.¹ This point suggests that Chaucer did not wait till he had finished his work to have parts of it copied out fair by his scribe. It would also account for the fact that the introductory stanzas to Book V are not distinct from the book. The Proems to Books II, III, and IV, being additions

¹ See Kemp Malone: *Chapters on Chaucer*, p. 120.

to the text, would be clearly labeled to indicate their proper position.² One further point: The likelihood of these three additional passages and none of the others (such as Troilus's hymn to love, or his soliloquy on fate and free will or his ascent to the eighth sphere) being lost would be slight unless we also assumed that Chaucer had his scribe start each new book on a new quire and that he kept his "original" in loose fascicles for convenience in revising it.³

University of Connecticut

CHARLES A. OWEN, JR.

The Date of Mandeville's Travels

The original composition, in French, of the *Travels* attributed to Sir John Mandeville certainly falls between the extreme limits of 1355, the earliest year of authorship stated by any version, and September, 1371, the scribal date given in the oldest datable manuscript (Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouv. acq. franç. 4515). This French text of 1371 states that the author composed his book in 1357; however, it bears no special authority, for it is avowedly a copy and its inaccuracies show that it does not closely represent the urschrift.¹ Anyone experienced with the easy comings and goings of *x*'s and *i*'s or *j*'s in the transcription of Roman numerals will not be surprised

¹If the *Equatorie* was intended as a continuation of the *Astrolabe* (see Price, 156 ff. for discussion of this possibility), Chaucer was following the same practice. For he had clearly allowed the first part, the *Treatise on the Astrolabe* to be copied out fair before he had completed the work as a whole. He must also have followed this practise in his unfinished poems, though of course we cannot be sure that he had them fair copied before he had decided to do no further work on them, except in the case of the *Canterbury Tales*, where for instance the *Prologue* still lacks some portraits.

²See Price, p. 13 f. for the three groups of quires that make up the text and two sets of tables of the *Equatorie*.

³Although Johann Vogels—*Die ungedruckten lateinischen Versionen Mandeville's* (Crefeld, 1886), p. 8 (fn), and *Handschriftliche Untersuchungen über die englische Version Mandeville's* (Crefeld, 1891), p. 20—considered it to be "die beste der französischen Handschriften" and to offer "einen durchaus zuverlässigen Text," it has always been recognized (even by Vogels) to contain errors. Recent studies have removed it far from the source of the line of descent. See Malcolm Letts, *Mandeville's Travels: Texts and Translations*, The Hakluyt Society (1953 for 1950), II, 227: "Now in some ways the most striking feature of the MS., in view of its early date, is the extent of its corruption"; and Josephine Waters Bennett, *The Rediscovery of Sir John Mandeville*, The Modern Language Association of America Monograph Series, XIX (New York, 1954), p. 140: "The Paris . . . texts have not been collated. We can be sure, however, that the 1371 manuscript is a poor copy of this version."

to learn that three other dates (1355, 1356, and 1366) occur for the year of composition in various manuscripts of several languages.² Nor would the writer's own words carry much weight, in any event. Whether—according to different theories of the authorship—he was an individual traveler, plagiarist, or romancer or a syndicate of fabricators, he certainly did not specialize in factual truth. Even if all the manuscripts agreed on a single date, we should have no reason to assume that the book actually was circulated in the stated year of composition.³

Paul Hamelius probably is correct in regarding a time "soon after 1362"⁴ as the *terminus a quo* in dating the *Travels*; for Mandeville remarks, "It is but little more than eight score years that all Tartary was in subjection and in servage to other nations about," and his principal source of miscellaneous information, Vincent de Beauvais, dates the rise of the Tartars from 1202.⁵ Hamelius more explicitly sets the likely date of composition as 1366, the year when Edward III repudiated the supremacy of the pope, because of a Latin dedication to Edward appended to many of the Anglo-French texts, declaring him "to be chiefly revered above all mortals."⁶ This somewhat weak case for 1366 was strengthened, though by no means fully confirmed, through an independent line of argument advanced by Arpad Steiner.⁷ Reasoning both positively and negatively from certain statements of Mandeville concerning the political geography of Eastern Europe, Steiner holds that the *Travels* could not have been composed before 1365, when Louis the Great of Hungary began the conquest of Bulgaria, or more than a few months after November 17, 1370, when Louis succeeded to the throne of Poland. He concludes:

Thus, the date of composition of *Mandeville's Travels* may easily have been

² The Latin "vulgate" gives 1355; English texts divide between 1356 and 1366.

³ Mrs. Bennett, in accord with her desire to relieve Mandeville of the centuries-old charge of vulgar lying, is inclined to accept literally the date of writing stated by the Anglo-French version, which she holds to be the original form of the *Travels*. Nevertheless, the core of her important book is a reinterpretation of the author as a self-conscious literary artist, and she concedes (*Rediscovery*, p. 151): "While the date 1356 is obviously the authentic date given in the best texts, it may, of course, be fictitious."

⁴ Ed. *Mandeville's Travels*, Early English Text Society, II (1923 for 1916), 14.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

⁷ "The Date of Composition of *Mandeville's Travels*," *Speculum*, IX (1934), 144-147.

1366 as was assumed by Warner. But whether the dedication addressed to Edward III is genuine or spurious, the *Travels* were composed between 1365 and the early part of 1371.⁸

A passage in the envoy of the English version of the *Travels*, highly relevant to the date of composition, or rather translation, has been a great mystery:

And ye shall understand, if it like you, that at mine homecoming I came to Rome and showed my life to our holy father the pope, and was assoiled of all that lay in my conscience. . . . And among all I showed him this treatise that I had made after information of men that knew of things that I had not seen myself, and also of marvels and customs that I had seen myself, as far as God would give me grace; and besought his holy fatherhood that my book might be examined and corrected by advice of his wise and discreet council. And our holy father, of his special grace, remitted my book to be examined and proved by the advice of his said council, by the which my book was proved for true. . . . And so my book, albeit that many men ne list not to give credence to nothing but to that that they see with their eye, ne be the author ne the person never so true, is affirmed and proved by our holy father in manner and form as I have said.

Hamelius, in keeping with his general theory of the antipapal nature of the *Travels*, attributes this claim of having visited Rome to the author's habitual impudence and anticlericalism.⁹ Malcolm Letts, on the other hand, follows the more usual line of comment in observing: "The story about the pope is no doubt spurious. It is also a curious blunder, as between 1305 and 1378 the popes were at Avignon."¹⁰ Johann Vogels¹¹ and G. F. Warner¹² had long previously insisted on the same point: that there was no pope in Rome at any time when *Mandeville's Travels* could possibly have been written.

Vogels, Warner, and Letts—in fact, all critics except Hamelius—certainly are right in treating the quoted passage as an interpolation. It occurs only in English, and there is also another compelling reason for recognizing it as spurious. In the standard English text of the *Travels* (British Museum, Cotton Titus c. XVI) it is followed by a statement that before writing his book the author has already "come home"; similarly, in the defective text (represented by most of the English manuscripts) and in the complete Northern version (British

⁸ P. 147.

⁹ *Ed. cit.*, II, 15, 147.

¹⁰ *Sir John Mandeville; the Man and his Book* (London, 1949), p. 162.

¹¹ *Handschriftliche Untersuchungen*, p. 26.

¹² "Mandeville, Sir John," *Dictionary of National Biography*, XII (originally 1893), 909.

Museum, Egerton 1982), it is preceded by a statement that at the time of writing he has "come to rest."

Interpolation or not, the crude assertion of having visited the pope in Rome could not conceivably have been invented at a time when there was no pope at Rome or ever had been within the memory of living men. The most ready explanation is that the *Travels* was not translated into English until ten years or more after it had started its career as the medieval equivalent of a best seller. Vogels, indeed, was satisfied with that assumption,¹³ and it appears that no extant English manuscript antedates, or very much antedates, the fifteenth century. Yet Mandeville pretended to be, and very likely was, an Englishman; his book was by far the most popular of its time; and it almost certainly was written either at Liège, which as the "vulgate" Latin text mentions "lies only two days from English waters," or, according to the recent well-documented argument of Josephine Waters Bennett,¹⁴ actually on English soil. Nothing is less probable than a long delay in the Englishing of the *Travels* ("that every man of my nation may understand it"). And there was a pope at Rome at exactly the time when the book was most likely to have been translated.

Ten years before Gregory XI (1370-78) ended the Babylonian Captivity in 1377, his predecessor, Urban V (1362-70), had already made an abortive effort to return the papal court to Italy. Urban left Avignon in April of 1367 and arrived at Rome later that year. He remained in Rome or the vicinity for three years before departing in September of 1370 for Avignon, where he died on December 19.¹⁵ If *Mandeville's Travels* was written in French in or about 1366, and if a translator a year or so later had wished to insert a passage about visiting the pope, we should expect precisely what we find. To be sure, the alleged date of composition given in the text from which he was translating (probably 1356, or possibly 1366) would have required "Avignon" instead of "Rome" for retrospective accuracy, but we do not look to the English *Mandeville* for historical or logical

¹³ *Handschriftliche Untersuchungen*, pp. 45, 52. Vogels believed the only English version lacking the "Rome" interpolation (an abridged translation from Latin represented by two manuscripts in the Bodleian: E. Museo 116 and Rawlinson D. 99) "sicher zwischen 1390 und 1400 entstanden zu sein," and regarded the popular translation from French as still later. But cf. Albert C. Baugh, *A Literary History of England* (New York, 1948), p. 267: "... it cannot be doubted that the translations were made soon after the original appeared."

¹⁴ Ch. 12, "The Place of Writing of the *Travels*," *Rediscovery*, pp. 170-180.

¹⁵ Henry Hart Milman, *History of Latin Christianity* (New York, 1880), vii, 215-218.

niceties. If at the time of translation the pope was in Rome—and, so far as anyone could predict, intended to remain there forever—the translator almost certainly would have written, as he did, "I came to Rome."

The Rice Institute

J. D. THOMAS

More and Lucian

In the 10th chapter of the First Book of *The Book Named the Governor*, where he prescribes a course of literary education for gentlemen, Sir Thomas Elyot discusses "what authors should be first read." Greek and Latin are, of course, the languages; but the authors themselves, no less than their order of study, may surprise us. Aesop first, directly after the rules of grammar or "interlacing . . . therewith"; then Lucian (or Aristophanes); then Homer. As Elyot puts the second stage: "The nexte lesson wolde be some quicke and mery dialoges, elect out of Luciane, whiche be without ribawdry, or to moche skorning, for either of them is exactly to be eschewed, especially for a noble man, the one anoyeing the soule, the other his estimation concerning his gravitie." He adds "thus moche dare I say, that it were better that a child shuld never rede any part of Luciane than all Luciane."¹

One would like to know exactly what dialogues, or parts of dialogues, Elyot approved of, but he does not tell us. We may guess, however, that *Charon*, with its lesson of vanity, was one of those approved. Hence, as evidence for the value of Lucian (and particularly of the *Charon*) in educating English gentlemen, it is of interest to note the following passage from Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (Bk. II, ch. 6)² and then compare it with Lucian. More writes:

Interim aurum argentumque (unde ea [pecunia] fit) sic apud se habent, ut ab nullo pluris aestimetur quam rerum ipsarum natura meretur. qua quis non videt quam longe infra ferrum sunt? ut sine quo non hercle magis quam absque igni atque aqua vivere mortales queant, cum interim auro argentoque nullum usum, quo non facile careamus, natura tribuerit, nisi hominum stultitia precium raritati fecisset.

¹ Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Booke Named The Governour*, ed. H. S. Croft (London, 1880), I, pp. 57-8.

² *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More*, ed. J. H. Lupton (Oxford, 1895), p. 174.

The relevant passage in Lucian is *Charon* 12,³ the dialogue within a dialogue in which Croesus and Solon discuss the same topic; and Solon, by use of Socratic dialectic, proves to Croesus that iron is more valuable than gold.

So. Tell me, is iron produced in Lydia?

Cr. Not too much.

So. Then you lack what is more valuable.

Cr. And just how is iron better than gold?

So. If you'll answer some questions without getting angry, you may learn.

Cr. Ask away, Solon.

So. Who are preferable—those who save others or those who are saved by others?

Cr. Those who save, obviously.

So. Well, then, if Cyrus, as rumor has it, is attacking Lydia, will you make gold swords for your army, or iron, as is necessary in such a case?

Cr. It's quite clear that they'll be iron.

So. And if you should fail to do this, wouldn't the gold leave Lydia for Persia on the point of a spear?

Cr. Watch your tongue, man!

So. I pray, of course, that this won't happen. But you do seem to be admitting that iron is better than gold.

The moral conveyed is the same; its tone of conveyance varies considerably. Lucian is "quicke and mery"; his morality is implicit in his wit. More is more didactic, and speaks openly of *stultitia hominum*.

Boston, Mass.

JOHN CROSSETT

The Title of Nash's *Pierce Penniless*

Aside from any literary echoes that may have been involved, there is also the possibility that the title of Nash's pamphlet "Pierce Penniless's Supplication to the Devil" made use of a pun on the word *pierce*. How good that possibility is will appear from scanning briefly the phonetic evidence about the words involved and from comparing a few similar Elizabethan word-plays.

³ *Charon* was not one of the four dialogues translated by More and Erasmus, but still Lucian was a favorite author of his, and he doubtless knew the *Charon* well. H. W. Donner (*Introduction to Utopia*, London, 1945, p. 16) sees Lucian's influence on the form of the *Utopia*.

Most of the phonetic evidence about *pierce* concerns the verb, which, however obscure its ultimate origin, is etymologically distinct from the baptismal name. There is an entry concerning one "William Pearce, or Perce, or Piers, or Perse, or Peirce, or Peirse, or Pearse" in the register of the University of Oxford for 1601,¹ and this seems to indicate conformity of the surname (a doublet of the given name) with most of the possibilities laid out below for the verb. But abundant evidence of this sort is not necessary, since we know that both the noun and the verb represent ME \bar{e} , whence their common modern pronunciation with [i]. This ME \bar{e} became Elizabethan [i:], for which the usual spelling was *ee*, as in *cheer*, *deer*.² By the side of this, however, there must have existed an Elizabethan pronunciation [e:] for the vowel of *pierce*, instanced by the spelling *ea*, by the rhyme *pierce: rehearse* (Folio: *pearce*) in *Richard II*, V, iii, 127, and by the statements of contemporary orthoepists.³ Kökeritz' idea is that this pronunciation goes back to a late ME lowering of $\bar{e}r$ to $\bar{e}r$ in "certain regional or class dialects."⁴

A second group of variant pronunciations of *pierce* is the result of a form with ME $\bar{e}r$, instanced by the Suffolk pronunciation [p \wedge s] and reported by contemporary orthoepists.⁵ Moreover in America both Webster and Worcester record *pierce* with the same vowel as *verse* into the second decade of the nineteenth century, although then as a second pronunciation; and Krapp points out a pronunciation [pərs], [p \wedge : s] for the proper name *Pierce*, *Pearce* in the United States, "which conservative family tradition may have sustained in some instances."⁶ The spelling *percing* in *The Rape of Lucrece*, l. 1091, may point to the same lax central vowel. But of course ME $\bar{e}r$ also frequently became *ar*, as in *parson* from *person*, and the fifteenth and sixteenth century spelling *parsoure* or *parser* for *piercer* may point to the possibility of this development for *pierce*.⁷

¹ Charles W. Bardsley, *Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames* (London, 1901), "Pierce."

² William Viotor, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (Marburg i. H., 1906), pp. 34-36.

³ Helge Kökeritz, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (New Haven, 1953), pp. 206-207.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 207.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 134. Pierce himself is called *Persie* by the Knight of the Post, Bodley Head ed. (G. B. Harrison, 1924), pp. 98, 109.

⁶ *The English Language in America* (New York, 1925), pp. 180-181.

⁷ Kökeritz, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

The phonetic evidence, then, seems to indicate the existence of several Elizabethan pronunciations for *pierce*: [pi:rs], [pe:rs], [pɜrs] or [p ʌ :s] and perhaps even [pars]. The list seems rather too long, and would be a stumbling-block if discussion of word-plays depended upon unambiguous phonetic analysis. Fortunately it does not. To take an example from our own times, where we have the best chance of deciding what is comic and why, Ogden Nash's

Good old Graham!
Always the Saham.

neither utilizes a perfect phonetic match nor (in all probability) was intended to.⁸ It does not indicate that *graham* is pronounced only [gre:m] any more than Walt Kelly's "parallelogram crackies" indicates that it is pronounced only [græ:m].⁹ Such word-play indicates simply that there are acceptable variants of the more nearly standard [greəm].

It would not be wise to assert that Elizabethans punned on words that were not always perfect phonetic twins if there were only modern examples as illustrations. But in the absence of contrary interpretations some fairly good evidence of this can be found in the Elizabethan age. Take as an example Holofernes' word-play in *Love's Labor's Lost*, IV, ii, 85:

Master parson, quasi pers-on. An if one should
be pierced, which is the one?

Kökeritz seems to assume that this indicates the vowel [a] for both *pers-* and *pierced*.¹⁰ But the possibility is at least as good that, substituting logic for wit, this is what Holofernes is saying: "'Parson' is also pronounced 'person,' which is the way a rustic might say 'pierce one,'" etc. In this case it would be important that the vowel of *pers-* not be [a], although it might be either [ɛ] or [ɜ]. As a matter of fact, it has seemed to me that a witty expression of the proposition "A is also pronounced B, even though the difference in the denotation of the two signals makes a manifest absurdity" is the basis of a significant class of word-plays. For the more common class, the proposition would be expressed thus: "A has (at least in some cases) the same pronunciation as B, even though the difference

⁸ "Uncalled-For Epitaph: The Sports Announcer," *The Face is Familiar* (New York, 1941), p. 165.

⁹ *Pogo* (New York, 1951), p. 57.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 207.

etc." In this class is Falstaff's play on *pierce*, *I Henry IV*, V, iii, 59:

If Percy be alive I'll pierce him.

where the vowel of *Perc-* and *pierce* may be either [ɜ] or [ɛ].

Finally, two quite similar plays on *purse* may serve to introduce my conclusions about Nash's title. One is Antonio's assurance to Bassanio, *Merchant of Venice*, I, i, 138:

My purse, my person, my extremest means
Lie all unlock'd to your occasions.

The other is the Chief Justice's accusation of Falstaff, *II Henry IV*, II, ii, 127 (Q):

... made her serve your uses both in purse and person.

Kökeritz says that the play here may involve "an imperfect linking of [ɜ:] and [a:]."¹¹ Similarly Vietor says that rhymes in *er* and *ur* "are always kept strictly apart; *verse* e. g. rhyming with *disperse* or *rehearse*, and *worse* . . . with *curse* or *nurse*, but never *verse* with *curse*, &c."¹² But this sort of observation is probably more applicable to the techniques of versification than to the techniques of word-play, for in the latter there have already been pointed out the tendency to take variant pronunciations into account and the delight in showing the absurdity of difference inhering in similarity.

With these principles in mind then, it seems quite likely that Nash intended a pun on *pierce* and *purse* in the title of his pamphlet. For one thing, it was apparently a recognized variant to pronounce *pierce* with the vowel [ɜ], giving the word the same sound as *purse*. Furthermore, the absurdity of difference inhering in similarity is neatly pointed out by this dilemma into which the pun can be reduced: "‘Pierce Penniless’ can be pronounced and taken to denote ‘purse penniless,’ but this denotation is absurd because of both the spelling and the ludicrous picture of a purse making a supplication to the Devil."

University of Michigan

NIEL K. SNORTUM

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 252.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 24.

The Prosody of Milton's *Epitaph, L'Allegro and Il Penseroso*

In his *History of English Prosody* Saintsbury, who declared that the "... ear which cannot hear the music of *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, or of the even greater and certainly not less sweet close of *Comus* must be deaf alike to the harp of Ariel and the lute of Apollo," himself failed to distinguish among Milton's tetrameters. "The 'Marchioness of Winchester' epitaph," he wrote, "goes with *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, for the metre of which it is a less perfect study." While noting the long history of the octosyllabic-heptasyllabic line in English and mentioning specifically Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate as poets whom Milton would have known, he makes Shakespeare the primary influence. Milton had, he thought, merely to "... catch the key-note ..." of the fairy poetry at the opening of the Second Act of *A Mid-Summer Night's Dream*, whose measure "... pirouettes on either foot, iamb or trochee, with equal ease, and 'twinkles interchange' of the two with almost bewildering but never-failing accuracy and intricacy combined. ..." Complementing Saintsbury, Enid Hamer would extend the Shakespearean influence to include Greene's "Havelok" couplets, Fletcher's *The Faithfull Shepheardess*, and the pastorals of William Browne and George Wither.¹ Professor S. Ernest Sprott, one of the most recent students of Milton's prosody, in an admirably enlightening technical discussion of the octosyllabic couplets is content to relate them generically to the Chaucerian tradition.²

This paper takes its point of departure from the insistence of the late Professor Havens that the four-stress lines of the *Epitaph* are to be distinguished from those of *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*.³ This distinction is very likely implicit in E. M. W. Tillyard's observation: "In April 1631 the Marchioness of Winchester died, and Milton celebrated her death in octosyllabics. It is highly probable that he continued his essay in that metre with *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*. They are less indebted to contemporary literature than the *Epitaph* which suggests Jonson and Browne."⁴

¹ *The Metres of English Poetry* (New York, 1930), pp. 28-31.

² *Milton's Art of Prosody* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 16-18.

³ *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 439.

⁴ *The Miltonic Setting* (New York, 1949), p. 25. The whole argument of my paper depends upon the *Epitaph's* antedating *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*. Most critics, I believe, would hold with Tillyard that it does.

It is a commonplace that Ben Jonson is the great master in the 17th century of funerary verse. His measure is normally the four-stress line, sometimes in regular octosyllables, as in *On My First Daughter*:

Here lyes, to each her parents ruth,
 Mary, the daughter of their youth:
 Yet all heavens gifts being heavens due
 It makes the father, lesse, to rue
 . . .

But Jonson was also the master of the much more subtle style of the Epitaph on Elizabeth L. H.

Would'st thou heare what man can say
 In a little? Reader, stay.
 Under-neath this stone doth lye
 As much beautie as could dye:
 Which in life did harbour give
 To more virtue than doth live.
 If, at all, she had a fault,
 Leave it buryed in this vault.
 One name was Elizabeth,
 Th' other, let it sleepe with death:
 Fitter, where it dyed, to tell,
 Than that it liv'd at all. Farewell!

With Professor Sprott I prefer to call such lines iambs with the initial unstressed syllable suppressed (except for ll. 4 and 6, each of which is composed of an antibacchius and an ionic a minore), but, whether initially catalectic iambs or trochees, all except l. 12 are heptasyllables and the predominating rhythm is falling. The startling thing about them is that though written in what is usually called a "dancing" metre the effect is far from facile. On the contrary, as the theme demands, the movement is weighted and sombre. Jonson here, I think, reverses the normal effect of falling rhythm by two principal devices. He keeps his diction basically monosyllabic (there

are only eleven polysyllables in the twelve lines) and he introduces a heavy caesura, unusual in tetrameters.

From Jonson the 17th century learned the secret of stateliness in the four-stress line. In his regular octosyllabics but especially in his heptasyllables he had demonstrated to his contemporaries its full potentiality for solemn effect. Bishop King and Marvell are his most brilliant followers in the full "eights" but his "sevens" obviously were no less admired. In the latter mould William Browne's epitaph on the Countess of Pembroke (is it Browne's or Jonson's?), utilizing the Jonsonian devices with comparable mastery, is the most famous but Crashaw's *Upon the Death of the most desired Mr. Herry* is scarcely less successful. It was this funerary art of Jonson, made familiar by the *Folio* of 1616, which Milton had in mind, I think, when he wrote the *Epitaph*. If there is, a partial justification for the observation of a recent critic that the versification of the *Epitaph* ". . . looks rather like an experiment in an as yet incompletely mastered form,"⁵ it lies in the fact that at times in that poem Milton mingled octosyllables and heptasyllables with uncertain results. But ll. 47-59 constitute a block of heptasyllables in falling rhythm not unworthy to be set beside Jonson's best:

Gentle Lady may thy grave
Peace and quiet ever have;
After this thy travail sore
Sweet rest cease thee evermore,
That to give the world encrease,
Shortned hast thy own lives lease,
Here besides the sorrowing
That thy noble House doth bring,
Here be tears of perfect moan
Weept for thee in *Helicon*,
And som Flowers and som Bays
For thy Hears to strew the ways
Sent thee from the banks of Came,
. . .

⁵ Ants Oras, "Metre and Chronology in Milton's 'Epitaph on the Marchio-

The rhythmic effect of the heptasyllables of *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* is radically different from this. To dramatize the extent of the difference I juxtapose ll. 69-80 from *L'Allegro*, all but two of which are in falling rhythm:

Streit mine eye hath caught new pleasures
 Whilst the Landskip round it measures,
 Russet Lawns and Fallows Gray,
 Where the nibling flocks do stray,
 Mountains on whose barren brest
 The labouring clouds do often rest;
 Meadows trim with daisies pide,
 Shallow Brooks, and Rivers wide.
 Towers and Battlements it sees
 Boosom'd high in tufted Trees,
 Wher perhaps som beauty lies,
 The Cynosure of neighbouring eyes.

Whereas the thirteen lines from the *Epitaph* are shackled by the weighted caesura and a diction that admits an average of only one polysyllable per line, the twelve lines from *L'Allegro* contain twenty polysyllables. Moreover, the caesura virtually disappears, the rhymes are all on front vowels and there is a deliberate marshalling of liquid and sibilant consonants to accelerate movement.

What is the explanation for this striking contrast in rhythms within the limitations of the tetrameter line? Here I venture a conjecture. Is it too rash to link Professor Tillyard's explanation of the origin of *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* with Milton's choice of metres? Tillyard, it will be recalled, holds the companion poems to be a 'poetical exercise' on the subject of the *First Prolusion* and the opening ten lines of *L'Allegro* to be, subject-wise, a burlesque based on the Cambridge composition. Further, he suggests that, stylistically, the bombastic opening lines may be a burlesque of Milton's own overly-ambitious poem on the Gunpowder Plot and of a long complex of 'horrid' writing including Virgil, Seneca, the University Wits,

ness of Winchester,' *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*," *Notes and Queries*, CXCVIII (1953), 333.

and Giles and Phineas Fletcher. We know that Milton's sense of decorum virtually reduced the Latin elegy to an apprentice piece and we recall his violent abjuration of rhyme in the preface to *Paradise Lost*. Possessed of such sensitivity to form, may he not have felt that Jonson's practice and his own limited imitation of Jonson had conferred upon the four-stress line in falling rhythm an esoteric ponderousness and resolved in *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* to indicate the rightful (in the main, traditional) use together with the limitations of the heptasyllabic and octosyllabic line. In any event he never again employed the tetrameter in the manner of the *Epitaph*. The tetrameters of *Comus* do not differ essentially from those of *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* and when he came to write his great elegies he cast one in Latin hexameters and the other in modified-canzone stanzas.

Marquette University

MICHAEL F. MOLONEY

Steele, The Junto and *The Tatler* No. 4

In the early years of the eighteenth century, as every student of the period knows, politics were woven closely into the fabric of everyday London life, coloring religion, education, and the arts. Literature was especially susceptible to this coloration; indeed, one may almost assume that a given literary work of the time has a political orientation, is expressive in some way of its author's partisan views. Such an assumption we find repeatedly confirmed in the works of Richard Steele, and it should therefore come as no surprise, although it has not heretofore been noted, that Steele made the apparently innocuous *Tatler* a vehicle for partisan propaganda from its earliest beginnings.

The first four issues of *The Tatler*, it will be remembered, were distributed free in April, 1709, to encourage subscription. In the fourth number, of 19 April 1709, Steele inserted an allegorical fable that was nothing less than a propaganda piece for the Whig Junto, the group of Whig leaders who then controlled the Government in an uneasy coalition with Godolphin and the Duke of Marlborough. Though various editors have noted the allegory, none has explained its political significance.¹

¹ All references to *The Tatler* herein are to the edition of George A. Aitken (London, 1898-99).

The allegory, in the section of the paper entitled "From my own Apartment," has the form of a fabulous travel narrative, purporting to be an account of "Felicia," an "island in America." Isaac Bickerstaff reports that letters from Felicia inform him

that the island was never in greater prosperity, or the administration in so good hands, since the death of their late valiant king. These letters import, that the chief minister has entered into a firm league with the ablest and best men of the nation, to carry on the cause of liberty, to the encouragement of religion, virtue, and honour. Those persons at the helm are so useful, and in themselves of such weight, that their strict alliance must needs tend to the universal prosperity of the people.

Bickerstaff then names those persons at the helm, giving each a little "puff" of praise, a sentence or two long. He calls them Camillo, Horatio, Martio, Philander, and Verono. He concludes: "The influence of these personages, who are men of such distinguished parts and virtues, makes the people enjoy the utmost tranquillity in the midst of a war, and gives them undoubted hopes of a secure peace from their vigilance and integrity."

Editors of annotated editions have recognized that Felicia represents Great Britain and that the ministers mentioned by Bickerstaff may be identified with actual persons. Camillo, for example, who "presides over the deliberations of state; and is so highly valued by all men, for his singular probity, courage, affability, and love of mankind," clearly represents John, Lord Somers, Lord President of the Council, a man whom even Swift later called "in the highest degree Courteous and Complaisant."² Horatio "makes all the public despatches," and is also "master of all the languages in use to great perfection. . . ." Horatio's description fits Charles Spencer, Earl of Sunderland, then Secretary of State for the Southern Department. In this capacity he was expected to "make the public despatches."³ Sunderland's considerable learning was recognized by the diarist Evelyn when the future statesman was still a boy, and he must have extended his linguistic ability while serving as envoy to the Austrian Empire in 1705. At any rate, a few years later Steele again remarked on Sunderland's "great Facility and Elegance in all the Modern as well as Ancient Languages."⁴ Martio, "a man of most undaunted resolu-

² *The History of the Four Last Years of the Queen*, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford, 1951), p. 5.

³ See Mark A. Thomson, *The Secretaries of State, 1681-1782* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 90-104.

⁴ Dedication to collected edition of *The Spectator*, Volume VI (published 11

tion and great knowledge in maritime affairs; famous for destroying the navy of the Franks," is beyond a doubt Edward, Earl of Orford, victor over the French at La Hogue in 1692, and former First Lord of the Admiralty, who was to be reappointed to that position later in 1709. Philander, "a nobleman who has the most refined taste of the true pleasures and elegance of life, joined to an indefatigable industry in business; a man eloquent in assemblies," probably represents Charles, Lord Halifax. Halifax had proved himself "indefatigable in business" as a lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer under King William (in which positions he was largely responsible for the foundation of the Bank of England), and Steele later referred to Halifax's eloquence as "the Life and Genius of the Conversation."⁵ Verono, Bickerstaff reports, "has lately set sail to his government of Patricia. . . . This minister is master of great abilities, and is as industrious and restless for the preservation of the liberties of the people, as the greatest enemy can be to subvert them." Verono is Thomas, Earl of Wharton, who had been appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in November 1708 and had left London early in April for the post, with Joseph Addison as his secretary.

If these identifications are accepted it will be seen that the five ministers referred to are in fact the five lords of the Whig Junto, who had secured *de facto* control of the Government in the winter of 1708-09 despite the Queen's opposition. The Government is the "firm league" Steele describes, and the "chief minister" with whom the league was made is of course Sidney Godolphin, Lord Treasurer and actual head of that Government.

The "firm league" was in reality a very unstable coalition ministry composed of two elements, the Junto Whigs and the Godolphin-Marlborough group. In November 1708, the Junto, taking advantage of Queen Anne's grief over the death of her consort (who had died in October) and of her quarrel with Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough,

April 1713), as reprinted in *The Correspondence of Richard Steele*, ed. Rae Blanchard (Oxford, 1941), p. 469. Hereafter referred to as *Correspondence*.

It is to be noted that the identification of Horatio with Sunderland is not the traditional one, all editions that I have seen preferring Godolphin. This seems incorrect, for the "chief minister" with whom the five worthies have entered a firm league is Godolphin. Furthermore, neither the *DNB* nor his latest biographer (Tresham Lever, *Godolphin* [London, 1952]) mentions any marked linguistic facility on Godolphin's part.

Aitken, *The Tatler*, I, 45n, described a manuscript note "written early in the last [i. e. eighteenth] century" on an original issue of *The Tatler* identifying Horatio as Sunderland.

⁵ *Correspondence*, pp. 462-463.

pressed Wharton into the Lord Lieutenancy and Somers into the key post of Lord President of the Council—despite Godolphin's hostility.⁶

The Junto Whigs, however, found their victory in many respects a hollow one. Marlborough's war on the continent was becoming increasingly unpopular with the British people, who in the spring of 1709 faced higher taxes, a steadily rising national debt, and the necessity of augmenting Marlborough's army, severely depleted by the heavy casualties of the preceding campaigns. None of these measures was likely to win favor for the Junto with a war-weary people. A few months earlier Henry St. John had written Robert Harley, the other leader of the Tory opposition, a letter revealing the experienced politician's view of the Government's plight:

I am as much convinced as it is possible to be that going out of employment at the time and in the manner [i. e., by resignation] we did was equally honest and prudent. No man's opinion can add any weight to confirm me in this thought. . . . But that they should think of raising sixteen regiments more, and of mortgaging [taxing] either land or malt, is to my apprehension downright infatuation and what I am glad of.⁷

The weather, too, seemed to conspire against the Junto. The winter of 1708-09 had been one of the severest ever experienced in Europe: the swift Rhone froze across, the canals of Venice were blocked by ice, an ice fair was held on the Thames. One observer wrote to his brother: "If I might tell you all the stories are daily brought in of accidents occasioned by the great frost I might fill sheets, as children down upon the Thames, post-boys being brought in by their horses to their stages froze to their horses stone dead. . . ." ⁸ The terrible cold was followed by prolonged rains and general crop failure. A week after *The Tatler* No. 4 appeared corn was reported more than double its usual price.⁹

Bickerstaff's statement that "the island was never in greater prosperity" was, then, if not outright propaganda at least the judgment of an excessively optimistic observer. *The Tatler* No. 4 is in fact a celebration of the recent Junto victory written by Steele in jubilant

⁶ For a general account of the political situation see George M. Trevelyan, *England Under Queen Anne* (London, 1930-34), II, 384-391. See also George N. Clark, *The Later Stuarts*, rev. ed. (Oxford, 1940), pp. 215-216, and Keith G. Feiling, *A History of the Tory Party: 1640-1714* (Oxford, 1924), pp. 406-407.

⁷ H. M. C., *Bath MSS.*, I, 193-194.

⁸ Peter Wentworth, *The Wentworth Papers, 1705-1739*, ed. James J. Cartwright (London, 1883), p. 68.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

awareness that his political friends had finally secured a position of control. It is also a propaganda piece composed with the mournful knowledge that the ruling Whig lords needed all of the support they could find to stay in office.

Steele lent such support in the pages of *The Tatler* on occasions too numerous to mention here.¹⁰ *The Tatler* No. 4 is significant because it was the first of these occasions, but its greater significance, perhaps, is as another example of the extraordinarily close relationship between literature and politics in the early eighteenth century. Politics, for Steele as for Swift, was not merely a means of livelihood; it was a manifestation of a way of life. Political journalism, for Addison, for Defoe, for Swift, for Steele, was important work, worthy of the best a writer had in him. It is not surprising, therefore, to find politics among the multifarious subjects which make *The Tatler* and *The Spectator* such incomparable commentaries on life in Queen Anne's London. Politics belonged there.

Dartmouth College

CALHOUN WINTON

A James "Gift" to Edith Wharton

However great was Henry James's general influence upon her writing, Edith Wharton always resented the imputation that he had any direct responsibility for what she wrote. Something of this is apparent in her impatient refutation of the persistent story that James had prompted the writing of *Ethan Frome*. She scouted the rumor that said that it was upon his advice that she had decided to make an English novella out of a little narrative exercise in French done some years earlier. "That legend," she declared, "must be classed among the other inventions which honour me by connecting my name with his in the field of letters."¹

Nevertheless, one minor work of hers does owe its genesis to a

¹⁰ See my unpublished dissertation, "Richard Steele: The Political Writer" (Princeton, 1955), pp. 26-129.

¹ "The Writing of *Ethan Frome*," *The Colophon*, xi (September, 1932). Reprinted in *Breaking into Print* (New York, 1937), ed. Elmer Adler, p. 190.

suggestion made by James. In an unpublished letter dated January 7, 1908,² James wrote Mrs. Wharton:

Je vous le donne, je vous le donne indeed, our petite donnée, which I perfectly remember every word of our talk about, & which I applaud to the echo the fructification of in your rich intelligence! Sharp & vivid came back to me the crown and consummation we formulated (for the original limited anecdote;) the voyage *d'enquête* by the Englishwoman relative or reporter, & the remarkable—the startling (they must startle her!) constataions she was to be led to on the spot. It think it as beautiful & âpre (as Bourget would say of your faculty for it!) a little ironic subject as ever—& no, I *don't* feel, on interrogating myself, that there is any objection that *counts* to your using it. My sense of the whole matter is a little coloured today, no doubt, by the fact that oddly enough I am more or less surrounded (as it were) by the English actors in the affair: that is the Sidney Waterlows, Jack Pollack's brother-in-law & sister have taken a house here for the winter, & Jack himself, who is most charming & sympathetic, comes down sometimes to see them—and is even soon to spend a Sunday with *me*. (I meet, at rare intervals, Gladys Holman Hunt in town—the said Jack's massive Ariadne; but *her* side of the drama is less present to me.) My own impression that the “impossibility” of “Mrs. Professor Joy” (textual) has been in no quarter (not even by the youth!) fully *realized*, & that the postulate of the “pretext” hasn't therefore been brought home, affords a sufficient *cover* or protection: which is still further afforded moreover by the fact that your “free hand” rests on your complete personal ignorance of everyone concerned—in the midst of which you have picked up, & been struck by, that anecdote as you'd have picked up, & been taken by, any other. It's *inevitable* of course the youth shld. be English—& it doesn't matter! I give you all my “rights” to it (all *honestly* come by—not a word of authentic light from anyone,) & I wish you a happy issue! Art is long & everything else is accidental & unimportant.) Only give false scents all you can & *appuyez* on the English relative, who doesn't exist in the original. She might be Mary Cadwalader's acquaintance Miss Warrander (if you've seen the latter.)—

The story for which James had given Edith Wharton the *donnée* was easily recognized as “The Pretext” which appeared in *Scribner's Magazine* in August, 1908, and was included in the collection *The Hermit and the Wild Woman and Other Stories*, published the following month. She must have written it almost immediately after receiving James's approval, for by the end of January she had sent it to the editors of *Scribner's*.³

² A copy of this letter, the original of which is not available, was made by Percy Lubbock in the course of preparing his two-volume edition of James' letters published in 1920. The letter is not included in the collection, but Mr. Lubbock's copy is now in the Harvard Library. My use of it is owing to the courtesy of the Harvard Library and the executors of the James estate.

³ As indicated in an unpublished letter to her publisher dated January 27,

"The Pretext" is an ironic little tale of illusion. Guy Dawnish, the young English visitor to the New England college town of Wentworth, has found friends in the University's legal representative and his wife—particularly in the wife whose matronly primness shields a tenderness which life has failed to utilize heretofore. But the friendship of Dawnish has made a sudden difference. Outwardly the same, Margaret Ransom finds herself now aware of things richer and more romantic than Wentworth dreams of—the dense background of this charming, aristocratic Englishman, and emotions of her own that are not acknowledged in the conversation of her neighbors. She permits herself to believe that Dawnish has been in love with her, and when he has left cherishes a dream of a love too perfect to have needed vulgar expression. Reading afterwards in a newspaper a notice that his prospective marriage has been broken off, she imagines that his love for her has been the cause. And then she has another visitor from overseas—James's "Englishwoman relative or reporter," Guy Dawnish's aunt, come to investigate his reasons for breaking his engagement. He had claimed, it would seem, that he had fallen in love with Mrs. Ransom. Upon meeting Mrs. Ransom, however, the aunt at once assumes that, of course, some other woman is the *real* reason; she sees at a glance the "impossibility" for that role of this middle-aged image of American propriety. She goes frustratedly back without having found the "lady in the case"—only Margaret Ransom knows that there has been no American innamorata at all; he has simply used her as a "pretext."⁴

1908. This letter has been examined through the courtesy of Charles Scribner's Sons, who have retained it in their files.

⁴It is not difficult to identify the actual persons concerned in the bit of gossip James passed on to Edith Wharton, although the resemblance between the actual events and Edith Wharton's rendition in the story can hardly be traced with confidence. The chief actor, "Jack himself," is obviously Sir John Pollock, whose sister, Alice Isabella, married Sir Sidney Perigal Waterlow in 1902. Obviously James refers to a relationship between Pollock and Gladys Holman Hunt, the daughter of the Pre-Raphaelite painter, a relationship presumably broken off since she is termed "the said Jack's massive Ariadne." Guy Dawnish, at any rate, does play the role of Theseus to an unnamed British fiancée in Mrs. Wharton's fiction. Dawnish's visit to the American college town may have its basis in Pollock's actual visit to Cambridge, Mass. in 1903-4, when he attended Harvard Law School. The son of the famous jurist Frederick Pollock, to whom Harvard had given an honorary L. L. D. and who was a friend of Justice Holmes and William James, young Pollock would have found many friends in the Harvard community. The originals of Professor and Mrs. Ransom are not so clearly indicated by the cautious James, and the visiting English aunt is James's own improvisation for whom he suggests a real life model, however, in a friend of Edith Wharton's own sister-in-law, Mary Cadwalader Jones.

This "beautiful and *âpre*" little theme is full of Jamesian possibilities which Edith Wharton realized with a skill that James might not have improved upon himself. The "international situation" created by the intrusion of Old England into a New England village is a sounding-box of his typical ironies. More than this, however—the illusioned American woman has her moral triumph over the man who has "used" her in just the degree that James allows to many of his heroines. The treatment is Edith Wharton's rather than James's—a certain crispness, a certain dryness, a relish in the "joke" itself as much as in the reverberations set up within the characters illustrates her preference for anecdote over psychology. It is a perfect small instance of her art applied upon an occasion provided by her friend Henry James.

Brown University

MILLICENT BELL

The Reflection of Poe in Conrad Aiken's "Strange Moonlight"

Most of Conrad Aiken's short stories are hauntingly elusive, full of provocatively mysterious effects and connotations. An Aiken story, as Mark Shorer remarked after quoting a portion of "Strange Moonlight," is "a horror all wrapped up in an actuality, a fantasy all rooted and real."¹ In such a texture it is unfortunately easy for explication to lose its way.

The textural landscape of "Strange Moonlight" is no less crowded with the dense foliage of Aiken's imagination than, say, "Silent Snow, Secret Snow," but in the former there is a track which, when followed, can lead us to the meaning of the story. This "track" is Aiken's deliberate use of Poe's "Annabel Lee" for the purpose of thematic contrast so that in its final effect the story is an ironic commentary on the poem.

No one can fail to be struck by the frequency with which Poe is directly or indirectly evoked in the story. That these allusions are not merely the half-conscious echoings of a literate and literary mind, such as are found in many modern fictions, can be assumed from the intro-

¹ Mark Shorer, "The Life in the Fiction," *Wake*, no. 11 (1952), p. 58.

duction of Poe into the very first paragraph of the story. The young boy has filched a volume of Poe from his mother's bookcase, and, as a consequence, has dreamed himself into a "delirious night in inferno." In his nightmare he is accompanied by what would seem to be a dream-distortion of a raven: "Down, down he had gone with heavy clangs about him . . . and a strange companion of protean shape and size, walking and talking beside him. For the most part, this companion seemed to be nothing but a voice and a wing—an enormous jagged black wing, soft and drooping like a bat's." And further on in the story the boy does not take a book of Poe with him to the beach only because he knows his parents would not approve.

Other more indirect "reflections" of Poe weave in and out of the story. The description of Caroline Lee (whose name, in view of the context, can hardly be accidental) is highly suggestive of Poe's descriptions of such women as Ligeia, Berenice and Morella. Like these figures, Caroline Lee has an "extraordinarily strange" beauty, with "dark hair and large pale eyes, and . . . forehead and hands curiously transparent."² Caroline Lee's house, "dim and exciting" and "mysterious and rich," full of rich tapestries, clocks, trophies, statues and winding staircases, conjures up (because of the context) images of the houses in which various of Poe's characters work out their strange destinies. Moreover the boy's obsessive preoccupation with various objects—a bird, a medal, a goldpiece—reminds one of the neurotic concentration on sensory phenomena of several of Poe's characters.³ But most important, the central situation in both story and poem is precisely the same: a young girl dies, leaving the boy who loves her to come to terms with the loss.

Even though Poe's poem is quite well known, it is necessary to pause for a moment on the implications of the final stanza. After recounting the nature and history of his love for the dead girl in the first four stanzas, the poet asserts that he cannot, or at any rate will not, accept the distinction between memory and perception,

² "There is no exquisite beauty," says the narrator in "Ligeia," "without some *strangeness* in the proportion." (The italics are Poe's.) Ligeia has "marble hands," a "lofty and pale forehead," and "raven hair." Berenice has "jetty hair" which falls over a "forehead . . . high and very pale." Morella's skin is so transparent that one can see "blue veins upon a pale forehead."

³ In "Berenice," for example, the narrator talks of his "nervous intensity of interest," which causes him to muse for long unwearied hours, with [his] attention riveted to some frivolous device . . . to become absorbed . . . in a quaint shadow falling aslant upon the tapestry . . . to lose [himself] for an entire night in watching the steady flame of a lamp, or the embers of a fire . . ."

between life and death: in the night he "dreams" himself across the barrier of death and lies down with his darling "In her sepulchre there by the sea." His solution to the anguish of loss is, in effect, to wipe out its reality. That this solution is ultimately destructive to the moral and esthetic resources of life is the main burden of "Strange Moonlight."

The boy in Aiken's story must also reconcile himself to the death of a loved one. At first, the death of Caroline Lee leaves the boy "stified" and "frightened," but above all "incredulous": "How was it possible for anyone, whom one actually knew, to die? Particularly anyone so vividly and beautifully remembered. . . . Had she actually died?" And before the pressures of an insistent reality force him to withdraw from it, the boy's solution is Poe's: Caroline Lee hadn't really "died"; there is no death unless you believe in it. Accordingly, he projects a wish-fulfillment fantasy much like the final stanza of Poe's poem. "What does it feel like to die—were you sorry?" he asks the dead child. Caroline Lee assures him that it is not at all what he thinks, that when the funeral is over "you just get up and walk away. You climb out of the earth just as easily as you'd climb out of bed." And most comforting for the boy, she tells him that at night, if he brings a lantern, he can come and see her.

The death of Caroline Lee, however, is the crisis not the inception of the boy's struggle to break through the limitations of his adolescent mind. The death of the child and the other incidents in the "tremendous week" "all seemed to unite, as if they were merely aspects of the same thing." The boy's bewildered anguish at the death of Caroline Lee, as Aiken indicates, is but the logical culmination of the boy's inability to distinguish between the various levels of experience: everything strikes his delicately receptive sensibilities with hard but essentially undifferentiated impact. This confusion is first shown in a passage which is a symbolic prefiguration of the crisis. After having received a medal at school, the boy runs to a nearby park which had once been a graveyard and opens the box. "He was dazzled. The medal was of gold, and rested on a tiny blue satin cushion. His name was engraved on it—yes, actually cut into the gold; he felt the incisions with his fingernail. It was an experience not wholly to be comprehended. He put the box down in the grass and detached himself from it . . . and stared first at the tombstone and then at the small gold object, as if to discover the relationship between them. . . . Amazing." To the mind unable to grasp the qualitative

differences in experience, the medal given to the living and the monument erected to the dead—each hard, emblematic, incised—run together. Here, as in the instance of Caroline Lee, the outlines of life and death are blurred.

This distortion shows up in still another passage. While playing with his sister and brother, the boy sees a goldfinch fly into the room, dart to and fro, and then flash out over the trees. "This was beautiful," he thinks, "it was like the vision in the infernal city, like the medal in the grass." But the distorting equation of shadow and substance vaguely disturbs him; suddenly sensing a crucial moment in what he dimly knows as an "inevitable approach toward a vast and beautiful or terrible conclusion," he begins to ponder the death of Caroline Lee (who had died a few days earlier) and arrives, as we have seen, at the "beautiful" not the "terrible" conclusion—that there is no death.

The insubstantiality of this conclusion, however, is first symbolized at the beach where his family has gone on a picnic, and in which the "chief event of the afternoon was the burial of his father, who had his bathing suit on." The very grammar of the sentence with its startling final qualifying clause hints at the resolution. As the boy watches his father in the "grave" of sand, he thinks that "It was singularly as Caroline had described it, for there he was all alive in it, and talking, and able to get up whenever he liked." But the disturbing impact of the details of his father's body as he runs down to the sea—the brown upturned soles, the mouth blowing water, the strong white arms flashing in the sunlight—prefigures the boy's final understanding of death.

On the way home from the beach the boy senses that "everything was changed." The nature of this change is brilliantly dramatized in the final paragraph, in which the polarities which have bewildered the boy are subtly organized.

And their house, when at last they stopped before it, how strange it was! The moonlight, falling through the two tall swaying oaks, cast a moving pattern of shadow and light all over its face. Slow swirls and spirals of black and silver, dizzy gallops, quiet pools of light abruptly shattered, all silently followed the swishing of leaves against the moon. It was like a vine of moonlight, which suddenly grew all over the house. . . . He stared up at this while his father fitted the key into the lock, feeling the ghostly vine grow strangely over his face and hands. Was it in this, at last, that he would find the explanation of all that bewildered him? Caroline, no doubt, would understand it; she was a sort of moonlight herself. He went slowly up the stairs.

But as he took the medal and a small pink shell out of his pocket, and put them on the desk, he realized at last that Caroline was dead.

Here the death of Caroline Lee and the boy's lingering awareness of her presence are brought into perspective. Caroline Lee still "is," but only like moonlight ("She was a sort of moonlight"), which depends upon being reflected from a solid substance for its existence. (Earlier, the boy thinks that the "mystery" of Caroline Lee's death is "like the moonlight on the white wall. Surely beneath it there was something solid and simple.") Like "the vine of moonlight" on the boy's face and hands, Caroline Lee exists only as a poignant shadow, a "ghostly" memory, a ray of moonlight. The gold medal and pink shell, however, are something "solid and simple," palpable objects of the world of substance, no longer "like" the vision in his dream or the haunting presence of the dead girl. But the "terrible" conclusion—what Poe cannot accept—is really the "beautiful" one, for now the boy can feel the beauty of *life as life*, the intensity of which, tragically enough, depends upon the full awareness of death. Perhaps the final irony is that the moon, which in Poe's poem is the magical prerequisite for experiential distortion ("For the moon never beams without bringing me dreams / Of the beautiful Annabel Lee") is here the mechanism for the boy's clarification of the terms of human life, and the consequent extension of its moral and esthetic resources.

Indiana University

SEYMOUR L. GROSS

Old Provençal *Desmentir sos pairis*

This phrase occurs in a poem by Guillem Ademar:¹ the lady, who once captivated the poet by her *boca rizen* and the encouraging words of love she addressed to him, has now completely changed her attitude. He curses that fateful moment when he fell in love with her, giving vent to his despair in the following words:

- Lo jorn volgra fos part Roais,
26. en caitivier de Sarrasis,
que leis ni sos pensars m'atrais;
27. quar tan mal desmen sos pairis.

¹ Kurt Almqvist, *Poésies du troubadour Guilhem Adémar*, Uppsala, 1951, No. III, ll. 25-28.

Editor's translation: "J'eusse aimé être prisonnier des Sarrasins, au-delà d'Édesse, le jour où elle m'attira à elle, elle-même et les pensées qu'elle éveilla en moi; car elle ne dément point ses parrains."

In order to arrive at this translation, the editor has interpreted *leis* (line 27) as a nominative, following Appel,² and has changed the original *qui* of the manuscript to *que* ('the day . . . that she attracted me . . .'); I propose that the nominative *qui* be retained, that *leis* be interpreted, in the usual way, as an oblique form and that the verb *atraire* be taken literally as 'bring (draw, lead, introduce)': we would then read: 'the day that brought her, and her thoughts, to me.' And such an interpretation, though at first glance it may seem less plausible than that offered by the editor, is amply corroborated by the evidence of Provençal love poetry, as regards the use of the verb *atraire*: if in our poem it is the 'day' that brings the lady to the poet, in others it is *fin'amors* or something (someone) else that brings her: *E pus fin'amors la m'atray, Per dreyt no m'en deu venir dans*: Peire Raimon de Toloza P.-C. 355, 13 (ed. Cavaliere no. XI); *Qar fin'amors³ m'atrais Vostre bel cors, don me lau de chاوزir*, the same P.-C. 355, 6 (Cavaliere no. V); *Mout mi plai* (sc. my lover) *quar sai que val mais Cel que plus desir que m'aia, E cel que primiers lo m'atrais Dieu prec que joi l'atraia* Beatritz de Dia P.-C. 46, 1 (ed. Schultz-Gora, *Prov. Dichterinnen* p. 17) ll. 11 and 12; *Que mal grat vostre·us am e·us amaraï E mal grat mieu, mas amors m'o atrai* El. de Barjols (?) P.-C. 132, 2 (ed. Stroński No. XIV) l. 40.

As to the meaning of the last of the four lines quoted above, the editor remarks in a footnote to his translation (p. 111): "elle ne dément pas son nom de baptême," and adds in an explanatory note (p. 198): "La dame du troubadour a dû porter un nom qui pouvait être interprété comme exprimant sa cruauté." This cannot be correct for the simple reason that *mal* is not a negation.⁴ The adverb *tan* by which *mal* is qualified (and which is neglected in the translation) clearly shows that the word means what it generally does: "in a bad way, badly." So the poet says the very contrary of what the editor has him say: the lady does belie her godfathers. How could it be otherwise? Who would expect a godfather to give a child a name that would predestine it to become a cruel person? Would the godfather

² *Provenzalische Inedita aus Pariser Handschriften*, Leipzig, 1890, p. 117.

³ This is the reading of the manuscript. Following Crescini, Cavaliere put *Q'a fin'amor* in his text, a change that is as unnecessary as Appel's in our poem.

⁴ The two passages which Appel mentions in the glossary of his edition of Bernart de Ventadorn (42,25 and 43,45) are by no means convincing.

not rather wish the child he presents at the font to become good and happy? ⁵

What probably led the editor to his wrong interpretation is the role that the godfather plays today in Protestant countries, a role basically limited to giving the child his own name and taking a friendly, but rather passive interest in the child's development. The situation was different in the Middle Ages, and still is in the Catholic Church. The godfather who presents a child for the sacrament vouches for the proper religious education of the child, thus contracting with the newly baptized being the relation of spiritual parentage. "Right so as he that engendreth a child is his fleshly fader right so is his godfather his fadere spiritueel," says Chaucer.⁶ The importance which the Church attributed to the function of godfather led to the establishment of certain strict rules concerning the character of the godfather and his attitude toward the sacramental act. The deep significance of the godfather's role is revealed in these two solemn passages quoted by Godefroy (X, 282):

Je te conjur de Dieu de majesté
par les parins qui de fons t'ont levé . . .
que tu me dies la verité

and

Par cele foi que je doi mes pairins.

How seriously godfathers took their educational obligations may be illustrated by another literary example, taken from the so-called "Philomena," a kind of prose chanson de geste of the fourteenth century dealing with Charlemagne's expedition against the Infidels in Carcassonne and Narbonne. The Moslem princess Orianda wants to become a Christian, and the Emperor himself offers to be her godfather:

E la dona Orianda, vestida d'un drap de
ceda blanca, en una tina plena d'aigua
ondrament la batejeron. E Karles tenc la
en las fons e foc (= fo) sos payris e fo
apelada d'aqui enant Orianda de Montesclaire . . .
E can foron a la tenda de Karles, elh donec

⁵ In his thorough and illuminating review of Almqvist's edition (*Studi med.*, n. s., xvii 1951, 359 ff.), Aurelio Roncaglia also rejects the editor's interpretation of our passage (p. 364). But he, too, thinks only of the name-giving function of the godfather, referring to two *senhals* that occur in Guillem's poems: *na Bona-nasques* (No. IV, 10) and *na Mala-nasques* (No. VII, 23). We doubt that this is sufficient to explain the phrase *desmentir sos pairis*.

⁶ Quoted *Oxf. Engl. Dict.* iv, 271 c from "Parson's Tale."

a sa filhola. . C. cavals nobles e bos e
 .C. mantels ab gonelhas folradas de pels
 vairas e d'erminis e .C. entre copas
 e enaps d'aur e d'argent, pregans ela
 que fos bona dona e fisels crestiana
 e que ames Dieu e fesese be a paubres e que
 fos be garnida de bonas costumas e de
 bonesa e de saviesa. Et ela ac gran gaug,
 car tan dossament e tan bona la
 ensenhava. . . .⁷

It is in the light of these facts that we have to interpret the passage of Guillem's poem. It is not that the *nomen* given to the lady becomes to her an *omen*, but that, hard-hearted as she is, she does not act according to the good intentions and teachings of her godfathers.

Unless other evidence is provided for the phrase *desmentir sos pairis*, we must consider Guilhem Ademar as its inventor. His originality, however, would consist only in applying the verb *desmentir* to godfathers, for *desmentir* itself is still used in Mod. Fr. in the sense it has in our phrase. Littré (I, 1064 No. 4) defines it as "faire des choses indignes de" and provides, among others, this example from "Cinna": *Tu m'as fait démentir l'honneur de ma naissance*. As to Old Provençal, Levy (SWB II, 79 No. 5 and P. D. s. v. *dementir*) offers only reflexive *desmentir* in a sense similar to the one which concerns us here, rendering it by "ne pas répondre à ce qu'on attend." But the first example which Raynouard quotes and which is from Pons de Capdoill (Lex. Rom. IV, 205) shows the same transitive usage as ours. After having praised his lady, the poet continues (P.-C. 375, 3 ed. Napolski No. XXIII, l. 19):

Ja non creirai desmenta sas faissos
 midons, cui sui liges, on semblanz es
 que i ssia * franquessa e merces.

We can add another passage from Cadenet (P.-C. 106, 12 ed. Appel p. 54, l. 44). Cadenet, too, opposes the lady's beauty to her inexorable attitude: this he compares with a blooming flower which produces no seed, thus fading without profit to anyone:

⁷ *Gesta Karoli Magni ad Carcassonam et Norbonam (Philomena)* ed. F. Ed. Schneegans, Halle 1898 (Romanische Bibliothek ed. Wendelin Foerster No. 15) ll. 2559 ff.

* Napolski reads *issia*, which does not make sense.

Car es delida
leu flors, on mieills es florida;
q'ela se fraing per n'ien
qand so qe mostra desmen.*

The great influence which the godfather was supposed to exercise on the godchild through the spiritual parentage that linked them to each other led to the wide-spread belief that the godchild was apt to inherit certain mental, moral, and even physical qualities from his godfather, which were not necessarily always good ones.¹⁰ It is therefore not surprising to find another troubadour attributing a certain mishap in his life to a predisposition transmitted to him by his godfather. The troubadour Jaufre Rudel finishes his poem about his *amor de lonh* (ed. Jeanroy No. V) with these lines:

Mas so qu'ieu vuoill m'es atahis;
qu'enaissi-m fadet mos pairis
qu'ieu ames e no fos amatz,

words which the *tornada* repeats almost literally, only a little more bluntly:

Mas so qu'ieu vuoill m'es atahis.
Totz sia mauditz lo pairis
qe-m fadet q'ieu non fos amatz!

In the same poem, Jaufre Rudel, like Guilhem Ademar, speaks of a captivity in the country of the Saracens (l. 33-35):

Tant es sos pretz verais e fis
que lay el reng dels Sarrazis
fos hieu per lieys chaitius clamatz!

Guilhem Ademar probably knew this famous poem, and it is not impossible that he borrowed from his predecessor the two ideas, that of the godfather's influence and that of the captivity in Moslem countries, although he used them in different ways and for different purposes.¹¹

New York

KURT LEWENT

* Appel: "... wenn sie verleugnet, was sie zeigt (d. h. wenn sie nicht hält, was sie im Schein verspricht)."

¹⁰ For details of this superstition see Baechtold-Stäubli, *Handbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens* III, 796 f.

¹¹ The metrical constructions of the two poems do not betray that relationship, and hardly could. Being *cansos*, they had to offer individual and original metrical forms. The fact that both poets use rhymes in -is and the rhyme sequence a b a b for the first four lines of each stanza is not weighty enough to base any conclusion on them in this respect.

'Un temple sacré': A Note on Racine's *Phèdre*

In the last act of Racine's *Phèdre*, Hippolyte proposes that Aricie should flee with him from Trézène. This suggestion alarms her virtue, and Hippolyte says that he will vow to marry her in a temple with supernatural powers:

Aux portes de Trézène, et parmi ces tombeaux,
Des princes de ma race antiques sépultures,
Est un temple sacré formidable aux parjures.
C'est là que les mortels n'osent jurer en vain:
Le perfide y reçoit un châtiment soudain;
Et craignant d'y trouver la mort inévitable,
Le mensonge n'a point de frein plus redoutable.

(II. 1392-1398)

Racine, it has been said, has here made a bad slip, since this temple, if it exists, renders impossible the dénouement of his play; and this criticism has been given prominence in recent times by the abbé Bremond, who, in *Racine et Valéry*,¹ reproduces several pages from Gaillard's *Mélanges*² discussing the point. Scherer, in his recent *Dramaturgie classique*³ mentions this passage as an example of Seventeenth Century *invraisemblance* and comments: 'Personne ne s'est jamais aperçu de cette invraisemblance, ni Hippolyte, ni Thésée, ni Aricie, ni sans doute Racine, ni ses spectateurs, ni aucun des critiques qui ont étudié *Phèdre*, jusqu'à Gaillard qui la signale.' In this, however, he is mistaken: the fault was noticed in the early Eighteenth Century. Houdar de la Motte pointed it out in his *Discours sur la tragédie* (1730),⁴ adding that he owed it to the marquis de Lacé (sic); Louis Racine tried to answer the criticism,⁵ but it was reaffirmed by Voltaire,⁶ who tells us that it was the marquis de Lassai (sic) who drew the attention of both la Motte and himself to this fault in Racine.

It is always disquieting to find a flaw in a masterpiece, especially such an apparently serious one; and a criticism which has been upheld

¹ Paris, 1930, pp. 248-251.

² G. H. Gaillard, *Mélanges académiques, poétiques, littéraires, philologiques, critiques et historiques*, 4 vols., Paris, 1806. The relevant portion is vol. III, pp. 348-353.

³ *La Dramaturgie classique en France*, Paris, n. d., p. 375.

⁴ Houdar de la Motte, *Oeuvres de Théâtre. Avec plusieurs Discours sur la Tragédie*, Paris, 1730, vol. I, pp. 178-180.

⁵ *Remarques sur les tragédies de Jean Racine*, Paris, 1752, vol. 2, pp. 192-3.

⁶ *Dictionnaire philosophique*, article *Épreuve*.

by Houdar de la Motte, Voltaire, Bremond, and Scherer cannot be dismissed lightly, particularly when the only dissentient voice is that of Louis Racine.⁷ In an age which is prone to see even minor defects as indicating a radical fault in the conception of a work, it may not, perhaps, be inopportune to examine whether this criticism is really valid.

* * *

We must first see what the critics have said. Hippolyte, says la Motte, ought to have asked his father to accompany him to the temple and thus convinced him of his innocence. 'Thésée lui-même à qui ce Temple n'étoit pas inconnu, puisque c'était le tombeau de ses Aïeux, ne devoit-il pas s'aviser de cet expédient, pour décider entre sa femme & son fils: Racine n'a pas senti la contradiction; il n'a imaginé sans doute, qu'après coup, le privilege du Temple comme un ornement de la Piece, & pour le besoin present d'Hypolite, & il n'a pas aperçu les conséquences qu'on en pouvoit tirer contre Hypolite, & contre Thésée même.'—Aricie, not Hippolyte, says Voltaire, should have reminded Thésée of the temple: 'c'était Aricie qui devait demander à Thésée l'épreuve du temple de Trezène, d'autant plus que Thésée, immédiatement après, parle assez long-temps à cette princesse, laquelle oublie la seule chose qui pouvoit éclairer le père et justifier le fils. Cet oubli me paraît inexcusable [. . .] Si Aricie avait dit un mot, Thésée n'avait aucune excuse de ne pas conduire Hippolyte dans ce temple; mais alors il n'y avait plus de catastrophe.'—For Gaillard, not merely should Thésée and Hippolyte have thought of the temple, but Aricie, in Act V, ought to have asked Hippolyte why he had not mentioned it to his father; and Phèdre ought never to have allowed Oenone to accuse Hippolyte, since the truth was certain to be discovered. 'Plus j'y songe, et plus je trouve que c'est une faute réelle dans Racine,' he writes,⁸ 'et elle me paraît si considérable, puisqu'elle renverse après coup tout l'édifice de la pièce, que je ne puis concevoir que Racine ait pu y tomber.'

Two objections immediately present themselves: (1) Is it certain that the passage means what the critics think? It is true that Hippolyte says:

Le mensonge n'a point de frein plus redoutable; (l. 1398)

⁷ Miss Vera Orgel dismisses the criticism, without discussion, in her *New View of the Plays of Racine*, London, 1948, p. 197.

⁸ *Mélanges*, vol. 3, p. 352.

but if we take ll. 1394-1406 as a whole, it seems clear that the temple strikes down those who make false vows, insincere promises. Are we justified in taking it also to be a lie-detecting machine? (2) Neither Aricie nor Phèdre can be supposed to know of the existence of the temple. Hippolyte and Thésée are familiar with Trézène—though Thésée has been long absent—and must know the temple because it stands near the tombs of their ancestors (ll. 1392-1393). Aricie and Phèdre, on the other hand, are comparative strangers to Trézène, where they have resided some six months; and the temple stands outside the town on the road to Mycenae (ll. 1498-1501 and 1574-1576). Aricie knows nothing of the temple until Hippolyte mentions it; and there is no reason why Phèdre should be any better informed.

But even if neither of these objections was valid, it is arguable that the existence of the temple need not affect the action of the play in the least:

(1) Even if Phèdre did know of the existence of the temple, the false accusation against Hippolyte would still be made. The probability of detection appears seldom to deter criminals; and Phèdre could doubtless rely on her wits to keep her out of the temple. In any case, Phèdre is desperate: she is ready to commit suicide, but deterred by the fear of what would happen to her children if she did (ll. 861-868); and the false accusation is the only alternative. At the very least it will postpone, and at best prevent, the discovery of her shame; and even if the truth is eventually discovered, the situation is not thereby made any worse than it is already, and suicide remains a possibility.

(2) As for Thésée, given his character and situation, he can have no use for the temple. Fiery and impetuous, extremely susceptible to feminine charms and, after much philandering, finally subjugated by Phèdre (ll. 23-26, 448, 636), we should expect him to have implicit faith in his wife. Moreover, the evidence against Hippolyte is strong. Hippolyte's indifference to women is suspicious to a man of Thésée's temperament (ll. 1114-1118); Phèdre has previously asked to have Hippolyte banished from Athens (ll. 295-296 and 1029-1030); he himself receives Thésée coldly (ll. 1025-1026), and asks to be allowed to leave Trézène and not see Phèdre again (ll. 924-926); his sword is in Phèdre's possession; and the fact that the accusation is made by

Oenone, not Phèdre, lends it an appearance of objectivity. Above all, Thésée is convinced by Phèdre's tears:

J'ai vu, j'ai vu couler des larmes véritables. (I. 1442)

So strong is the circumstantial evidence, that Thésée has no doubt of his son's guilt and the temple can be of no use to him. Quick to anger, he condemns Hippolyte to death before doubts begin to arise in his mind; it is then too late to think of the temple, which thus cannot influence Thésée's actions in any way.⁹

(3) Hippolyte does not wish to have recourse to the temple. As Louis Racine pointed out, he wishes to spare his father by concealing the truth; a veiled hint is all that he will permit himself (ll. 1150-1152); it would be impossible for him to establish his own innocence without at the same time establishing Phèdre's guilt. We may add that Hippolyte's great admiration for his father and strong filial piety are stressed throughout the play (e. g. ll. 3-6, 74-94, 937-952); and that this is the reason he himself gives for his silence:

je supprime un secret qui vous touche.
Approuvez le respect qui me ferme la bouche.
(ll. 1089-1090)

Ai-je dû mettre au jour l'opprobre de son lit?
Devais-je, en lui faisant un récit trop sincère,
D'une indigne rougeur couvrir le front d'un père?
(ll. 1340-1342)

But this motive is certainly strengthened by the sense of disgust and shame with which Phèdre's advances have filled him. Though the influence of his mother and the spectacle of his father's frailties (ll. 69-94) make love repellent to him, he has yielded to his passion for Aricie, but not without a struggle and sense of guilt (ll. 531-552): Phèdre's admission of her love for him, coming on top of all this, fills him with shame (ll. 743-746), disgust, *horreur* (l. 718), and leaves him 'interdit, sans couleur' (l. 716). There is here a delicate study of a complex state of mind, and one which would certainly lead Hippolyte to lock Phèdre's secret in his own breast, not to publish it, even if he were not already restrained by filial piety.¹⁰

⁹ I cannot agree with Professor A. F. B. Clark, who, in his *Jean Racine*, Cambridge (U. S. A.), 1939, p. 206, calls Thésée "a windy and light-headed creature who jumps to conclusions without making the most obvious preliminary investigations."

¹⁰ Italo Siciliano seems to me to be mistaken when, in his *Racine. La vita e le opere*, Padua, 1950, he says that Hippolyte "perde inverosimilmente la

(4) Aricie gives the same reason for not revealing the truth as Hippolyte:

Votre fils, Seigneur, me défend de poursuivre.
Instruite du respect qu'il veut vous conserver,
Je l'affligerois trop si j'osois achever.
J'imité sa pudeur, et fuis votre présence
Pour n'être pas forcée à rompre le silence. (ll. 1446-1450)

It is relevant to point out, too, that Aricie, when she sees Thésée, does not know that he has pronounced Hippolyte's death sentence; and that it is, in any case, too late to save him. No action of Aricie in Act V could alter the dénouement.

* * *

In short, while it is, of course impossible to prove that Racine did not make a slip, it can be shown that, if he has made a slip, it is an insignificant one: the psychology of the play is much subtler, much more consistent and convincing than some writers have supposed, and Racine could have filled *Phèdre* from beginning to end with allusions to the temple of Trézène—thank Heavens he did not!—without altering the action of his play one jot. It is quite untrue that the temple ruins the catastrophe or 'renverse après coup tout l'édifice de la pièce.'

But it is, perhaps, possible to go further; it is arguable—as Professor Poulet has been kind enough to point out—that the conception of the temple is too much in harmony with the theme of the play to be anything but intentional. Here we are on less sure ground; but four points seem to deserve consideration:

(1) It is fitting that Racine should put the description of the temple of truth into the mouth of Hippolyte,—Hippolyte, the victim of *Phèdre*'s false accusation, about to go into exile for a crime he has not committed, and soon to receive a more terrible punishment still; Hippolyte, the soul of truth, who has just declared that:

Le jour n'est pas plus pur que le fond de mon cœur. (l. 1112)

(2) The site of the temple is doubly fitting. It is situated not only near Trézène, the scene of *Phèdre*'s perfidy, but at the very spot where Hippolyte falls a victim to the monster (ll. 1498-1501 and 1574-1576). The temple of truth thus stands close to the place of untruth, close to the place where perfidy appears to triumph over

parola davanti ad un'accusa infame ed infamante che dovrebbe rendergli impossibile il silenzio."

uprightness, as if to symbolize the eternal power of truth, even in the midst of injustice, oppression and falsehood.

(3) The temple punishes perfidy with death—and death is the punishment of both Oenone and Phèdre.

(4) Finally, it is fitting that the temple should be situated among tombs; for there is a connection between death and truth. At the moment of death, falsehood is cast aside and gives place to truth. So it often is in real life; so it is in the play. Phèdre confesses her crime and her deceit, after the death of Hippolyte and Oenone, as she herself awaits her self-inflicted death.

University College, Exeter

P. J. YARROW

Premiers exemples de l'emploi du terme *Renaissance*

J. Huizinga pensait que c'était Balzac qui s'était servi, le premier, "du mot *Renaissance* pour désigner une période de l'histoire de la civilisation."¹ *Le Bal de Sceaux* fut publié, en partie, dans *Le Voleur* du 4 janvier 1830, et la nouvelle tout entière parut en avril 1830. C'est là que se lit la phrase :

"Elle raisonnait facilement sur la peinture italienne ou flamande, sur le Moyen-Age ou la Renaissance."²

R. Canat citait un passage de H. Fortoul :

"Qui nous délivrera du moyen âge et de la Renaissance?"³

Cette phrase se trouve dans l'ouvrage *De l'art en Allemagne* (Paris, 1841), I, 107, où nous rencontrons aussi : "les pompes de la Renaissance" (p. 105). Mais ce livre était composé à l'aide d'articles publiés dans la *Revue de Paris*, de janvier à avril 1829. Consultons ces articles. Dans la livraison du 15 janvier 1829, nous relevons :

"Qui nous délivrera du moyen-âge et de la renaissance?" (I, 96)

"on n'y sait plus composer de drames qu'avec le petit manteau de la renaissance. . . ." (I, 97)⁴

¹ "Le Problème de la Renaissance," *RCC*, 40¹ (1938-1939), 173-174.

² *Scènes de la vie privée*, éd. Bouteron et Longnon, chez Conard (Paris, 1912), I, 83.

³ R. Canat. *L'Hellénisme des romantiques* (Paris, 1953), II, 34.

⁴ *De l'art*, I, 107-108 : "le petit manteau de la Renaissance . . ." La première

Le tome II de la *Revue de Paris* nous donne (p. 83) :

"cette grande question de la Renaissance qui agite aujourd'hui l'Europe. . ."

Le tome III contient les exemples suivants :

"le signal décisif de la Renaissance. . ." (p. 24)

"Quelle est la portée de la Renaissance. . ." (p. 42)

"les artistes de la Renaissance." (p. 43)

"une explication convenable de la Renaissance." (p. 49)

"les pompes païennes de la Renaissance." (p. 224)

Un autre exemple encore dans le tome IV :

"maîtres Italiens antérieurs à la Renaissance." (p. 137)

Comme nous l'avons déjà vu, Fortoul emploie aussi le mot *renaissance* pour désigner une époque (I, 97), et, aussi, pour désigner un retour vers des temps anciens et des modes de civilisation du passé :

"une renaissance plus grande encore et plus vraie que celle du XVI^e siècle.
(III, 43)

"la renaissance païenne." (III, 225)

"renaissance des idées et des formes antiques." (IV, 137)

"renaissance du paganisme." (IV, 139)

"renaissance païenne." (IV, 139)

Balzac, comme Fortoul, s'est servi du terme *Renaissance* pour l'appliquer aux arts. En 1832, "Sismondi a appliqué ce mot au domaine de la pensée politique" (Huizinga, p. 173) ; mais, en 1829, c'est Fortoul qui paraît avoir, le premier, utilisé le mot *Renaissance*, à propos d'une discussion sur l'art en Allemagne.

Harvard University

MARCEL FRANÇON

Zur Textkritik von Kleists *Der zerbrochene Krug*

In allen Kleistausgaben außer einer ¹ befindet sich in 11. Auftritt des Lustspiels *Der zerbrochene Krug* in einer Bühnenanweisung eine Stelle die unsere Beachtung verdient und bis jetzt noch nicht be-

d'*Henri III et sa cour* eut lieu le 11 février 1829 (voir H. Clouard, *Alexandre Dumas* [Paris, 1955], p. 77).

¹ *Heinrich von Kleists Werke*, herausgegeben von Rudolph Schlösser, Oskar Walzel und Karl Sieger. Hesse und Becker Verlag, Leipzig (ohne Datum). Dort steht mit Sperrdruck: (*Er zeigt seinen rechten Fuß*). (Auskunft mit Dank erhalten von einem Leser der *Modern Language Notes*—Manuskripte.)

... gesprochen worden ist. Es handelt sich um Dorfrichter Adams *linken* Fuß, der an elf Textstellen² erwähnt wird und zur Entlarvung des Schuldigen beiträgt. Der prüfende Gerichtsrat Walter fragt, ob jemand hier am Orte ist, der mißgeschaffene Füße hat. Sobald der Schreiber Licht auf den Richter weist, entgegnet dieser:

Ich weiß von nichts,
Zehn Jahre bin ich hier im Amt zu Huisum,
Soviel ich weiß, ist alles grad gewachsen.³

Während er spricht, zieht er die Füße ein, wird aber von Frau Marthe gesehen, die ausruft:

Lass' Er doch seine Füße draußen!
Was steckt Er untern Tisch verstört sie hin,
Daß man fast meint, Er wär' die Spur gegangen.⁴

Darauf Walter:

Wer? Der Herr Richter Adam?⁴

Und Adam:

Ich? die Spur?
Bin ich der Teufel? Ist das ein Pferdefuß?⁴

Hier folgt die Bühnenanweisung:

(Er zeigt seinen linken Fuß)⁴

Aller Logik nach sollte der Richter den rechten und normalen Fuß zeigen.⁶ Auch die Worte des Gerichtsrates lassen darüber keinen Zweifel:

Auf meine Ehr'. Der Fuß ist gut.⁷

Frau Marthe, die Klägerin, stimmt ihm bei, obwohl sie den Richter kurz vorher furchtlos verdächtigt hatte. Eine absichtliche Unwahrheit seitens des Gerichtsrates stünde auch im Widerspruch mit seiner

² Erich Schmidt, *Heinrich von Kleists Werke*. Kritisch durchgesehene und erläuterte Gesamtausgabe. Leipzig und Wien. Bibliographisches Institut. I, 324, 325/26, 413-16, 420.

³ *Ibid.*, 419

⁴ *Ibid.*, 420.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 420.

⁶ Laut Mitteilung des Regisseurs am Frankfurter Schauspielhause wird in deutschen Bühnentexten stets "der rechte Fuß" eingesetzt. 31. Aug. 1954.

⁷ Erich Schmidt, *op. cit.*, I, 420.

Haltung im Varianten des 12. Auftrittes gegenüber Eve, die ihm anfangs mißtraut, dann aber auf seine Frage:

So glaubst du jetzt, daß ich dir Wahrheit gab?*

mit Ja antwortet.

Die Tatsache,⁹ daß die oben besprochene Stelle im Original verlorengegangen ist, läßt einen Berichtigungsversuch vermuten, der möglicherweise nach der ersten Aufführung oder nach der Veröffentlichung unternommen wurde.

Syracuse University

ALBERT SCHOLZ

REVIEWS

René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism, Vol. I, The Later 18th Century, vol. II, The Romantic Age* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1955. ix + 358 pp.; ix + 459 pp. \$4.50 + \$5.50). THE Sterling Professor of Comparative Literature at Yale presents the first two volumes of a four volume undertaking. The present notice is thus of necessity no more than an interim report. Professor Wellek's researches over many years have displayed the scholarship, range and balance needed for the discharge of so exacting a task. We are reminded of his personal efforts to secure the establishment on a wider basis in the United States of Comparative Literature as a University study, and it is, no doubt, this context which he has had, in part at least, in mind while engaged upon the composition of his work. He anticipates the inevitable comparison with Saintsbury, whose book seems to him to lack interest in theory and aesthetics, and he defines his term 'criticism' as meaning broadly 'not only judgments of individual books and authors, "judicial" criticism, practical criticism, evidences of literary taste, but mainly what has been thought about the principles and theory of literature, its nature, its creation, its function, its effects, its relations to the other activities

* *Ibid.*, 450.

⁹ Dr. Boese, Leiter der Handschriftenabteilung, Öffentliche Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek vormals Staatsbibliothek Berlin vom 31.1.1952.

of man, its kind, devices and techniques, its origins and history.' (p. v)
The definition is therefore very wide indeed. The year 1750 is chosen
as the starting point, inasmuch as what went before seems to the
author to be largely antiquarian in interest, being the tail-end of
Renaissance doctrine. Inevitably Dryden, Pope and Addison and the
over-maligned Boileau have no place in this study, while lesser fry
such as Marmontel, La Harpe and Baretti are admitted. It seems
to me that chronology is not always an entirely satisfactory guide.
Professor Wellek sets out to devote himself to the forces 'which
illuminate and interpret our present situation,' but again one wonders
whether older critics, even the Ancients, should be excluded on that
account. The fact that certain critics have a place in the story of the
development of modern criticism is not always an indication of their
relevance to modern conditions.

Be that as it may, in this period ranging from Voltaire to Hugo and
Hegel, it is evident that the centre of gravity lies in Germany, with
France and England, despite the lead which they gave in the second
half of the 18th century, in very secondary positions. In the Romantic
Age, which is the subject of the second volume, the role of France
turns out to be small indeed. Those who have regarded France as the
country where criticism is the breath of literary life must needs agree
that this may be valid nationally but may not always have had inter-
national significance. But in that case, what of Görres and Solger, for
instance? Are they not equally of local rather than general interest?
And why should Adam Müller matter more than Byron? Doubts and
reservations of this kind will occur to many. They reflect in no way
upon Professor Wellek's profound scholarship but upon the subject,
which pursues a logic of its own and declines to fall into an easy
pattern. The author's summaries of the views of critics represented
are always concise and helpful, supported by pertinent quotation
and fortified by select, but ample and up-to-date, bibliographical
references. Voltaire, Diderot and their contemporaries; Dr. Johnson
and his; Lessing, Herder, Goethe, Kant and Schiller, fill the first
volume. The older and younger German Romanticists, Jeffrey,
Shelley, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Hazlitt, Lamb, Keats, Mme. de Staël,
Chateaubriand, Stendhal and Hugo are dealt with in the second, with
a chapter in each upon Italian criticism. The discussions of the
Schlegels are admirably composed; one recalls nothing so complete
or so lucid in English. Those of Kant and Coleridge sustain the
high standard of the author of *Kant in England*. Here is scholarship

disciplined, sober, informative and judicial, and yet, if the author could have found it possible to distribute a larger measure of light and shade, the result would have been even more useful and interesting than it undoubtedly is, for the volumes do not carry their readers forward with a swing. The critics do not stand out from their background, as one reader at least would have desired. The analyses of their works, amid so much that is of value, are not free from trivial detail of antiquarian interest. New and attractive vistas are outlined in the Conclusion, and final judgment must clearly be suspended until the last two volumes appear.

University of Leeds

A. GILLIES

Randolph Quirk and C. L. Wrenn, *An Old English Grammar* (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1955. x + 166 pp. Methuen's Old English Library 9 s. 6 d.). "THIS grammar is designed especially for the literary student of English, who has long been neglected in favor of his philologically inclined colleague and who is felt to be in need of a single compact grammar which will put the emphasis where he needs it most." Such is the aim of the book stated in the preface.

For this reason the book differs in many respects from the ordinary run of Old English grammars from Joseph Wright on. In the first place it does not treat Alfred's Older West Saxon, because the monuments and manuscripts belong to that period are too few. Instead the authors describe Ælfric's period of Late Old English not only because most of our manuscripts date from that period but also because West Saxon at that time was fast gaining status as Standard English of the time. For the same reasons the authors do not treat phonology and inflexions from a comparative Germanic point of view as is customary in historical grammars, but from Late Old English descriptive point of view. Furthermore, the authors follow Fernand Mossé's example in treating the Old English syntax, indeed, their syntax is now the fullest syntax available in any Old English grammar, as well as the longest chapter of their book (44 pp.) though not a great deal longer than the chapters on inflexions (39 pp.) and phonology (37 pp.).

To help the beginner they print some paradigms in black letters; to help the curious student they give considerable grammatical detail

and much historical information in small type. They also incorporate valuable references to books, old and new, in their text, but have no bibliography. They have a topical and word index in one piece at the end of the book.

The authors are not afraid to introduce new terminology where they feel it answers their descriptive purpose; thus they call the two types of adjective inflexions, traditionally called strong and weak (Grimm's terms), indefinite and definite, thus describing their functions by their new terms. Likewise they discard the strong and weak inflexion of verbs by the more descriptive terms, vocalic and consonantic, since the first class expresses differences in tense by changing vowels, the second is always marked by a consonantic suffix in the preterite.

The grammar seems to be excellently done. On the whole it seems less systematic than Mossé's grammar in his Old English textbook, but I would not be surprised if teachers would find it much more accurate in detail. Such things will be found out only by repeated use of students. One of the authors, Mr. Quirk, is no stranger to Old English grammar, for he has already written several articles on the subject, among other things on the moot point, whether the Old English short diphthongs, like *ea* are actually phonemic or only phonemic variants of the vowel *æ*, as claimed by M. Daunt and her followers, among them F. Mossé. Mr. Quirk has upheld the phonemic existence of *ea* and, naturally, he follows that point of view in this grammar, I think rightly.

A few queries or corrections may close the review.

On page 21 paragraph 28 one reads: A long syllable is one which has a long vowel. . . . It should read: a long vowel followed by a single consonant.

On page 31 paragraph 50 it is correctly stated that *eall*, *fea(we)*, *genóg*, *manig* and *óðer* never take a definite form of the adjectives, but no reason is given, neither here nor in the corresponding paragraph of the syntax (116). Why?

On page 81 in paragraph 131 on Voice the authors give a very common and very Modern English formulation: A passive infinitive was unusually expressed with the active form: *pás þing sind tó dónne* 'these things are to be done.' The formulation should rather be: In Old English the active infinitive was often impersonal (i. e. no subject was indicated) like the Modern English passive infinitive,

hence it has to be translated by a modern passive infinitive (violating the old activeness of the verb) in order to preserve the impersonality of the verb.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

Bede, *A History of the English Church and People*, tr. Leo Sherley-Price (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1955. 341 pp. 85c.). THIS new translation of Bede's great work is based on the edition of Charles Plummer and is accompanied by an introductory essay and a few pages of explanatory notes. The Introduction, which is adequate for a book of this sort, can be profitably read by most students of early England and is marred only by a slip or two (for instance, Cuthbert was not a "Celtic" saint [p. 25]) and by the tendency of the translator, who is a clergyman, to preach (pp. 30-31). The explanatory notes are also adequate but at times contain superfluities such as this sentence which follows an excellent definition of "Pelagianism": "This misconception is still strong today!" (p. 333, note to p. 49). The translation itself, however, can only be termed a poor one, and I will devote the remainder of this review to pointing out some of the errors which make it so.

It is the responsibility of the translator to be familiar with the scholarship devoted to the text he is translating, particularly when it deals with interpretations and meanings of words peculiar to the period in which the text was written. For instance, in what is probably the most famous passage in Bede, we are told that the Germanic settlers of Britain "Aduenerant autem de tribus Germaniae populis fortioribus, id est Saxonibus, Anglis, Iutis" (I, 15). Mr. Sherley-Price renders this "These new-comers were from the three most formidable races of Germany, the Saxons, Angles, and Jutes." Now Kemp Malone proved over thirty years ago (*MLR*, XX [1925], 1-11) and has restated several times (see *APS*, IV [1929], 89, and *Anglia Beiblatt*, LI [1940], 262-64) that Bede was using "Saxonibus, Anglis, Iutis" in a geographical rather than in an ethnological sense, and one would expect to find the words so translated. The fact that others have also failed to take cognizance of Professor Malone's findings (see for example, J. N. L. Myres, *The English Settlements*, p. 336, and F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 9) does not relieve the present translator of his responsibility.

Further down in the same Chapter there is another fault. Bede is giving the genealogy of Hengest and his brother Horsa, "Erant autem filii Uictgils, cuius pater Uitta, cuius pater Uecta, cuius pater Uoden." This is rendered "They were the sons of Victgilsus, whose father was Vecta, son of Woden." The omission of Witta is a grievous error because it is only through him that we have any hope of identifying the tribe to which the leaders of the first Germanic settlers belonged. A third type of fault is the substitution of one name for another. We are told that Edwin, King of Northumbria, ruled over both the Angles and the Britons (II, 5), but Mr. Sherley-Price translates "both Angles and Saxons." A fourth source of error is found in the attempt to make a smoother than usual translation. It is said that Ethelbert was "filius Irminrici, cuius pater Octa, cuius pater Oeric cognomento Oisc, a quo reges Cantuariorum solent Oiscingas cognominare," (II, 5) but our translator writes "Ethelbert was son of Irminric, son of Octa, and after his grandfather Orric, surnamed Oisc, the kings of Kent are commonly known as Oiscings." "Grandfather" here is wrong as, according to Bede, Oeric was Ethelbert's great-grandfather, but had the text been followed this wouldn't make any difference. Then there are errors which are simply mis-translations. As a translation of "sed reuocato domum Ulfrido primo suo antistite, ipsi episcopo Geuissorum, id est Occidentalium Saxonum, qui essent in Uenta ciuitate, subiacerent," (IV, 15) we have "for when Wilfrid its first bishop had been recalled home, it became dependent on the Bishop of the Gewissae, that is, the West Saxons, whose see was at Winchester," and for "per terras Iutorum, quae ad regionem Geuissorum pertinent," (IV, 16) "through the lands of the Jutes who live in the Gewissae country."

Although a list of similar errors could be multiplied indefinitely, there would be little point in doing so. It is a pity that having spent so much time already the translator did not take a bit longer and do a more workmanlike job.

Indiana University

ALLAN H. ORRICK

Hardin Craig, *English Religious Drama of the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. vi + 421 pp. \$6.75). THE many friends of Hardin Craig will feel a sense of pleasure at the appearance of this book. Earlier in the present century, in his edition of the two

surviving Coventry plays and in certain articles, he showed that he had something to contribute to our understanding of the medieval drama, but he listened to the siren call of the Renaissance. He has now come back into the fold, and we welcome his return to the field of his earlier interest.

An Introduction of 18 pages states the author's creed. He urges the study of the liturgical drama and its later vernacular developments in their own milieu and not "through the application to the mystery plays of the principles of drama as an art form" (p. 2). He implies that this has not been the "customary approach." "Writers of medieval religious drama had no doubt their own ways (however simple) of presenting their religious themes effectively. . . . Few studies of the techniques of playwrights and actors of the medieval religious drama have been made, except by persons who have not understood this aspect of the task." These are harsh words, uttered no doubt in a commendable excess of zeal and not really true. The same zeal perhaps leads to other statements which seem over-positive. "The origin of the religious drama must be thought of as a special act of invention in which impersonation, action, and dialogue happened to come together." It is difficult to make this fit the slow and tentative beginnings of the Easter trope. Again we are told that "we have here the strange case of a drama that was not striving to be dramatic but to be religious. . . ." Was there no "striving to be dramatic"? These are small matters. Craig rightly contends that the medieval religious drama expresses a way of life which was characteristic of the Middle Ages and should be studied sympathetically in the light of medieval beliefs and aspirations.

Two chapters sketch the development of the liturgical drama. These naturally follow Karl Young's masterly treatment and need not detain us. There are, however, certain inaccuracies of statement or idea that should be corrected in a future edition. Chapter III (*Transition Period*) concerns first of all the transition from the church to the street, and can hardly be said to contribute to our understanding of this obscure process. Nothing is said of the loss of musical accompaniment. The last ten pages of this chapter describe late developments of liturgical plays on the Continent, mainly Germany. Chapter IV treats briefly the matter of staging and the origin of the Corpus Christi plays. The author holds (rightly, I think) to his earlier view that the plays did not develop out of the Corpus Christi procession.

Indeed, it is hard to see how in the present state of our knowledge such a theory (cautiously accepted by Chambers) can be supported.

It is with Chapter V (*The Chester Cycle*), Chapter VI (*York-Wakefield Plays*), Chapter VII (*The Hegge Plays*), and Chapter VIII (*Single Mystery Plays and Parts of Cycles*) that the author reaches the area in which he has special competence. These chapters are excellent. While we may not agree with some of the views expressed, the discussion is adways stimulating and many interesting points are brought into focus. A long time ago I offered evidence from which I drew the conclusion that somewhere in the development of the Chester cycle the influence of the French dramatic tradition was felt. Craig accepts this and goes much farther. He maintains that the Chester plays were translated and adapted from the French. He may well be right. Such a view, of course, recognizes that there were later revisions in which material from the *Stanzaic Life* and elsewhere was introduced. With respect to the York-Towneley relationship Craig holds to the original-identity theory of Miss Lyle, whose thesis he directed. He believes that Towneley was taken over from York "at a certain rather late stage of cyclic development" and that "up to a fairly advanced stage of growth and development, these cycles underwent similar treatment in matters of revision" (p. 215). While I do not feel that the theory of original identity has been proved, and Craig would admit that it is incapable of actual proof, there is much in this chapter that deserves thoughtful consideration. One cannot help wondering how Wakefield could support a cycle the size of the *Towneley Plays*, especially in the beginning. It seems never to have been large in the Middle Ages and owed such growth as it had apparently to the increasing taxes in York which forced the woolen trades (and perhaps others) to go elsewhere. Unfortunately except for the aulnage figures we are very badly off for Wakefield records. On the other hand, the *York Memorandum Book*, which fills two volumes, has now been published as well as seven volumes of *York Civic Records*. (These are not listed in Craig's bibliography.) In connection with the transfers and amalgamations of plays which are recorded and in considering other revisions it is important to settle the date of the manuscript of the *York Plays*. Miss Smith dated it 1430-40 and Craig accepts this dating. But as Greg long ago pointed out, this is certainly too early; he expressed the opinion that no competent critic today would place it much before the middle of the second half of the century. One is glad to see the revision of the cycles

treated as a more or less continuing process with none of the older tendency to force the changes into certain (usually three) chronological stages. The *Towneley Plays* are treated less fully than the York cycle, but one paragraph on the greatest of the medieval playwrights seems to give the Wakefield Master rather short shrift.

The chapter on the *Hegge Plays* (*Ludus Coventriae*) is admirable, though somewhat oversimplified. It follows essentially Miss Swenson's thesis. The process of compilation could have been brought out more clearly by including some instances in which the compiler's procedure is revealed by the make-up of the manuscript rather than by anything in the text, a particularly striking example of which was pointed out by Greg. The evidence suggesting an association of the cycle at some stage with Lincoln is well marshalled and it must be said that Craig makes a strong case for this theory. But the closing lines of the Proclamation, with their reference to *N. town* are meaningless unless performances at another place or other places were contemplated. The chapters on the remnants of cycles and non-cycle plays, the miracle and morality plays, and the late survivals of the medieval dramatic tradition are all competently done. One notes the absence of any mention of E. N. S. Thompson's *The English Moral Plays*, and it would have been well to include, at least in the bibliography, Miss Cornelius's dissertation on *The Figurative Castle* and Professor Chew's *The Virtues Reconciled*.

There are many points over which one would gladly linger. It must suffice, however, to say that this is a good book, one from which students may not only derive general orientation in the field, but one to which scholars will turn constantly in connection with more specialized studies.

University of Pennsylvania

ALBERT C. BAUGH

Dudley David Griffith, *Bibliography of Chaucer 1908-1953* (Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press, 1955. xviii + 398 pp. Univ. of Washington Publications in Language and Literature, 13. \$5.00). AMONG the important features of a good bibliography, especially in a field as large as that of the studies of Chaucer, is the fact that it is likely to put students in its debt more than almost any other kind of scholarly contribution. And yet in part it may seem a thankless job; for many who use it will never have occasion to test its range

of reference or the general accuracy of its achievement. The present book is "planned as a supplement to" Miss Hammond's *Manual* and also to Miss Spurgeon's *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion* (p. vii), to each of which it adds some items and a considerable "extension of the years covered." It includes also the author's own bibliography of the years 1908 to 1924 (p. iv). According to Mr. Griffith's experience with his material (p. viii) the entries indicate (among other things) "an increased attention to language, style, and word study"—a refreshing observation in view of certain recent editions of the poet and the increasing number of modernizations and translations of his works. An important section of the book is devoted to "Backgrounds"—social, economic, religious, scientific, artistic, and so on. A prejudiced interpretation of Chaucer (such as might, rather arbitrarily, be found in the Introduction) could lead to a mistaken emphasis in the classification; but anything of that sort has played no part in the judicious arrangement of the book and its entries. If Lollius (under "Literary Relations and Sources") or Courtly love (under "Social Backgrounds") deserves special mention in the table of Contents, perhaps in each case the items should form a separate group in the sections concerned. Ideally perhaps there should be much more summary in the book of the material offered, but such a variorum for the whole field is now virtually impossible.

Indeed it is almost impossible to check all the references in order to give a decently reliable report on the inclusiveness and accuracy of what Mr. Griffith has achieved. The present reviewer can, however, testify that one can go through page after page for purposes of verification without discovering more than trivial errors or omissions, a few of which I list as evidence, rather, of the author's general integrity. Thus on page 27, under the heading of "Waugh" on Lollard Knights, the references on Lewis Clifford should include pp. 88-92 in *SHR* 11, 1914 (and not 1913). On page 34, it might be noted that Hawkins, "The Place of Group F," is reviewed in *MLN* 54, 1939, 140 ff. On page 209 with the material on the Clerk's Tale, Brown's Notes in *MLN* 56, 1941, 163 ff. (though cited on page 152) might be included. Indeed there might be some advantage in a somewhat more detailed summary of the various published "Notes" like Baum's (p. 216) or Cook's (p. 217) or Hinckley's (p. 217). A reference to Karl Young's article on "Vitremyte" (p. 235) might also be expected under Word Study (p. 150), though one may

possibly find an answer to this criticism in the reason for the repetition of the reference to Lowes on "hereos" (pp. 147, 189, and 179). Bad misprints (one of which is repeated in the Index, p. 391) occur in Whiting's title on page 271. Chaucer material of a fair sort, I think, may be found in *Spec* 8, 1933, pp. 41 ff. (light thing upward, *HF* 729 ff.) and *MLN* 68, 1953, 553 ff. (see pp. 72-73).

Perhaps the only serious deficiency I have noticed is in the Index, which is, I think, too limited. Names like Decameron, Teseida, Deschamps's Ballade, Roman de Carite, should, I believe, be entered, and topics like allegory, lyric, rhetoric, oral transmission. These would be far more useful than the list of references after the names of scholars, though both are needed. But if the Index as we have it is sometimes hard to use, the book as a whole is indispensable. In many ways it represents indeed a notable achievement.

Smith College

HOWARD R. PATCH

Henry Lyttleton Savage, *The "Gawain"-Poet: Studies in His Personality and Background* (Chapel Hill: The Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1956. xviii + 236 pp. \$6.00). AFTER long years of anticipation Robinson's *Chaucer* appeared in 1933. In the same year H. L. Savage, the Princeton archivist, began working on an edition of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, a project to which he has devoted himself unremittingly ever since and of which *The "Gawain"-Poet* is the first full fruit. It brings together the results of its author's numerous separate studies and presents much new evidence in support of the provocatively attractive hypothesis that many of the more perplexing problems of the poem (one alliterates in writing of an alliterative poem) can be solved most satisfactorily by associating it with Enguerrand de Coucy, the seventh Sire de Coucy, who came to England as a hostage after Poitiers and was married to the Princess Isabella, eldest daughter of Edward III, in 1365. A year later he was created Earl of Bedford, and he and his wife were recipients of much royal largesse before his final return to France in 1377.

The opening chapter, "'Master Anonymous,'" presents a brief account of the *Gawain*-poet as he is known to us through the four poems usually associated with him. Savage is of the opinion that he was very probably writing between 1365 and 1386, that his language

is that of the Northwest Midland counties (most likely that of the Yorkshire West Riding or of East Lancashire), that he was not a monk, and that he very possibly gained his knowledge of aristocratic life through service in the household of some great nobleman. Two such aristocrats with considerable holdings in Yorkshire and Lancashire were John of Gaunt and Enguerrand de Coucy (both also members of the Order of the Garter). "It is surmise, and not fact, that the *Gawain*-poet served either (or both) of these princes in some administrative or clerical capacity, but the surmise is far from being an unreasonable one and can be safely advanced until a better one is adduced." Both this chapter and especially the one which follows, "Symbolism and Allegory in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*," contain literary insights of a high order that remind us how very difficult it is to give any poem as complex as *Sir Gawain* a genuinely appreciative reading. In part this difficulty is the result of the average reader's inability to bring to it the kind of knowledge required for a full understanding of the text. Take the three famous parallel scenes, the hunting exploits and the interviews between Gawain and the lady. Savage's painstaking investigations of medieval hunting and heraldry show clearly that the poet was mindful of the period's distinction between beasts of venery and beasts of chase, for on the first two days Bercilak hunts deer and boar and his lady also pursues "noble game." "The amenities and decencies that mark the conduct and pursuits of gentlefolk are preserved in both forest and castle. On the second day she is no more successful. Like her husband in the forest, she has again roused noble game." But on the third day Bercilak captures a fox, a beast of vermin, and Gawain is false to his word when he accepts the gift of the lace: ". . . a false beast is roused in the forest, and a false man is revealed in the castle; a sly fox is caught in the wood, a 'sly fox' in the castle."

Space does not permit further comment on this abundantly rewarding study, the core of which is the third chapter, "A French Knight of the Garter," a fascinatingly exhaustive account of Enguerrand VII (see above), which is supplemented in great detail through the eleven appendices filling nearly half the book (pp. 123-218). The volume ends with a highly selective bibliography, which is also highly annoying to use because of its arrangement according to chapters and parts of chapters (the third chapter, e.g., has six parts). Not every reader will accept the author's hypothesis concerning the Sire de Coucy and the *Gawain*-poet, but everyone must envy the great learning, the

keen literary sense, the modesty which characterize this study and which make us look forward all the more eagerly to the promised edition of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.

Louisiana State University

THOMAS A. KIRBY

Samuel Schoenbaum, *Middleton's Tragedies, A Critical Study* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1955. xii + 276 pp. \$4.50). THIS book is in two parts: the first gives a critical account of the five tragedies which the author ascribes to Thomas Middleton in their presumed chronological order, the second discusses the evidence of their authorship. This arrangement has a neat and tidy air—as of the body of a book given over to literary criticism, with scholarly controversy conveniently relegated to an appendix. Unfortunately, by reason of the uncertainties of the canon, Middleton is of all the Jacobean dramatists the one least suited to this method of treatment. Dr. Schoenbaum admits that of the five plays under examination “only *Women Beware Women* has been regarded always as solely by Middleton. For the dramatist collaborated with Rowley on *The Changeling*, and the latter’s hand has been sought in *Hengist* as well,” while “the status of *The Revenger’s Tragedy* and *The Second Maiden’s Tragedy* is highly controversial.” This being so, an essay on “Middleton’s special contribution to the tragedy of his age” should, however disagreeably to superficial readers, be preceded and not followed by an examination of the evidence for Middleton’s authorship. The reversal of this order is, I think, more than a defect of arrangement. While making an initial demand upon our faith, it implies a promise to convince us in due course; so that any deficiencies in the evidence, when at length it comes, will be more serious.

This fundamental criticism of the book is one which Dr. Schoenbaum foresees but does not forestall. His very anxiety to be fair leads him to concede in his Preface that *The Revenger’s Tragedy* and *The Second Maiden’s Tragedy* are not “proved beyond question to be Middleton’s work.” Yet there is something equivocal in a position which concedes a doubt in theory while denying it in practice. It is all very well for Dr. Schoenbaum to explain, “I have avoided the clumsy qualification, ‘If indeed this play be Middleton’s’”; but if this qualification is always to be understood, then meaning vanishes from such statements as “It is hardly possible to overestimate the importance of *The Second Maiden’s Tragedy* in the development of

Middleton's art" (p. 67) or "The evolution from *The Revenger's Tragedy* [to *Women Beware Women*] is remarkable indeed" (p. 128). This kind of logical fallacy pervades the whole book. I find it difficult to know what value to attach to words like *possible*, *plausible*, *conclusive* as Dr. Schoenbaum uses them. As a minor instance, he says that the case for Tourneur's authorship of *The Revenger's Tragedy* "is certainly not conclusive"; but he must really find it very much less than that, since he accepts the play as Middleton's.

Having once written an essay on Tourneur which accepted his authorship of *The Revenger's Tragedy*, I may be thought a prejudiced witness, but, interest once declared, I may say that I think the arguments for Tourneur much stronger than they are here made to appear. The difference in style between *The Revenger's Tragedy* and Tourneur's *The Atheist's Tragedy* Dr. Schoenbaum illustrates by selective quotation: Vindice's apostrophe to the skull cannot fairly be set beside a passage so different in purpose as the description of Charlemont's supposed drowning, a set piece of narrative and not fully representative. Citation from *The Atheist's Tragedy* of D'Amville's soliloquy in the churchyard (iv. iii) might have left a very different impression. I am surprised, too, that "the biter bit" theme of *The Revenger's Tragedy* is held to be inconspicuous in *The Atheist's Tragedy*, which has its catastrophe in D'Amville's self-execution by the very axe-stroke with which he purposed to destroy his enemy. This episode follows one in which D'Amville's boast that he will "eternize" his "posterity" is greeted by the death of both his sons; so that the climax of *The Atheist's Tragedy* exhibits just such a "conscious ironic pointing" as Dr. Schoenbaum emphasizes in *The Revenger's Tragedy*. Indeed the most striking feature of Tourneur's dramatic technique in *The Atheist's Tragedy* is precisely that use of irony to express an ethical judgment which Dr. Schoenbaum finds in *The Revenger's Tragedy* but which leads him to associate *The Revenger's Tragedy* not with the tragedy of Tourneur but with the citizen comedies of Middleton. Moreover, in *The Revenger's Tragedy* sin not only brings its own destruction on the sinner, as in Middleton, but calls for the punishment of sinners at the hands of an outraged deity. "O thou almighty patience," cries Vindice, "Is there no thunder left"? in the same way as in *The Atheist's Tragedy* Castabella asks, "O patient Heaven! Why dost thou not express Thy wrath in thunderbolts"? And the thunder which comes in answer to Vindice's cry is from the same source as that which in

The Atheist's Tragedy condemns D'Amville's murder of Montferrers. There is thus an attitude of mind in *The Revenger's Tragedy*, more fundamental in my view than any parallels of phrasing, which allies the play with the accredited work of Tourneur and marks it off from that of Middleton. For similar reasons I find it hard to believe that *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, whether or not it is by Middleton, can be by the same author as *The Revenger's Tragedy*. The likenesses of situation, though obvious, are superficial. The corpse which kills a lecherous ruler with its poisoned lips in *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* is little more than the means to a sensational revenge, whereas the skull in *The Revenger's Tragedy* is both a symbol of universal mortality and an instrument of divine justice. Dr. Schoenbaum, recognizing a fundamental difference of mood, sees in it not a sign of different authorship but the influence of Fletcher.

All this is not to deny the usefulness of those chapters in which Dr. Schoenbaum presents the case for Middleton's authorship of these two plays. The evidence is entirely internal and most of it is not new; but he assembles it skilfully and more completely than it can be found elsewhere. Future students of Middleton and Tourneur will gratefully consult him. What they will not all do is accept this evidence as adequate.

The book's theory of Middleton's development and its generalizations about his tragic art cannot of course be more acceptable than the premises on which they rest. Fortunately it is possible to detach from a very questionable framework a series of self-contained accounts of individual plays. Dr. Schoenbaum succeeds in stimulating interest in the less familiar plays, and one particularly welcomes the study of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, which our habit of focussing more on playwrights than on plays has left in some critical neglect. The sources of each play are usefully summarized, with the playwright's deviations noted. But the actual criticism is not profound. Too much space is given to plot synopsis and to quoting insignificant opinions of other critics. The language and the characters are praised without precision, and they are treated too much as isolated entities instead of being related to the dramatic structure they subserve. If *The Revenger's Tragedy* is "an exercise in the stylization of conventions," then in relation to such a purpose the aphoristic couplets may be very far from naive; and if the actions of Lussurioso are part of the "formalized and artificial" design of this play, it will be an irrelevant comment that "he should have better sense." The compli-

cation
be pos
of dra
with
abnor
the re
of the
deline
transf
by ma
becom
the tr
itself
The "
praise
be sho
memo
fiance
her" t
The
he ma
ling.
illumi
and th
betwe
no dif
which
when l
Inev
But w
readily
and to
look f
should
appoin

West

cations of the character of Horsus in *Hengist King of Kent* it would be possible to refer not to psychological subtlety but to the succession of dramatic situations that this role is used to motivate. Similarly with De Flores himself: he may be a "remarkable exploration in abnormal psychology," but what is important in *The Changeling* is the relation between him and Beatrice. Middleton's transformation of the melodramatic source here is not just a matter of his ability to delineate character and write "searing verse." Primarily what he transformed was the situation itself; and he did this quite simply by making De Flores abhorrent to the lady whose paramour he was to become. From this springs not merely a potent dramatic irony but the tremendous tragic theme—how a human creature may destroy itself through coming to love what its nature loathes and sees as vile. The "concentration" of the language, which Dr. Schoenbaum rightly praises "in the entire conduct of the . . . main action" will best be shown not by citing "lines which linger mysteriously in the memory" but by showing how the language is used to point the significance of Beatrice's progress from "the temple where I first beheld her" to the "common sewer."

The perfunctoriness of Dr. Schoenbaum's treatment suggests that he may not have perceived all the deeper implications of *The Changeling*. He is apparently unaware of Miss Helen Gardner's brief but illuminating study of it in an article in *Essays and Studies* (1948); and though he knows Miss Bradbrook's demonstration of the relation between the two plots, he dismisses this in a three-line note. He sees no difficulty about ascribing to an inferior dramatist that final scene which seals the tragic greatness of the play—and he overstates the case when he says that this traditional view has gone unchallenged.

Inevitably with this book we come back to problems of authorship. But whatever differences of opinion those give rise to, it will be readily agreed that a power to convey the quality of *The Changeling*, and to a lesser degree *Women Beware Women*, is what we ultimately look for in a study of Middleton's tragedies. And it is here, at what should be the climax of his book, that Dr. Schoenbaum most disappoints us.

Westfield College, London

HAROLD JENKINS

Clay Hunt, *Donne's Poetry: Essays in Literary Analysis* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press: 1954. 256 pp. \$3.75). APPROXIMATELY half of this book is composed of detailed interpretations to the following poems: "The Indifferent," "Elegy 19," "Love's Alchemy," "The Blossom," "The Good-Morrow," "The Canonization," "Hymn to God, My God, in My Sickness." Each interpretation is made to contribute to part of a larger and more general pattern of interpretation. Then the last half of the book interprets the larger pattern and offers a judgment of Donne's poetry which is based upon the whole body of Donne's verse and prose. I have nothing but admiration for Mr. Hunt's purpose, which is to discover the nature of Donne's poetry, the causes of the shifts in Donne's reputation, and the reason for his twentieth-century revival. But I cannot admire the method or the results. The difficult goal Mr. Hunt has set for himself is that of collecting exact evidence and then drawing up a comprehensive critical judgment. But by an intemperate, even angry, fascination with the problem of Donne's fascinations, he is led to subtle transfers between the two difficult roles he has imposed upon himself. At crucial places the judge investigates and the investigator judges.

Since this review is written by a representative of the party of opposition, it will concern itself mostly with some of Mr. Hunt's errors. I shall not cultivate generosity in order to improve my persuasiveness. But I do, in candor, want to preface my adverse remarks with two expressions which qualify, in my mind, the single attitude of my review. First, Mr. Hunt is in my estimation no mean opponent. The case he presents ought not to be ignored, and deserves more answer than a review can provide. He is perceptive, learned, and witty; on many of the issues he writes with genuine feeling, which deserves respect; on some poems and some passages his observations are penetrating. Secondly, Mr. Hunt pulls together, with his own additions, the best of the critical objections to Donne which have been gathering head since his reputation began to rise to its new heights. Mr. Hunt is in error, I think; but the edifice of the error is orderly, as it were; most important, the error is now fully available for inspection. In the larger interest of the necessary cultural competition, this is a service that must be acknowledged and desired. Enlightened self-interest, if not charity, bids us remember our enemies in our prayers. No one has argued so hard at such length, or so energetically set out to explore Donne's limitations as a poet.

The judgment against Donne is summarized on page 148:

in his literary work we find an ear relatively dull to the sonorities of language; a limited sensory response and an insensitivity to many subtleties of emotion; a lack of pleasure in the beauties of the natural world and an inability to invest its physical facts with the aura of the romantic imagination; an absence of any strong feeling for the cultural traditions of his own civilization, or of any strong sense of personal community with the rest of mankind; and a certain deficiency in human sympathy.

As for Donne's positive qualities as a poet, the judgment plainly invites an appeal to other courts and other critics:

What was left to make poetry out of? Not very much, and certainly very little of what is normally thought of as promising poetic material: a hard eye for physical fact; a clean and brilliant analytical mind, and a lively but predominantly conceptual imagination; wide learning in fields of abstract thought; a theatrical sense; a personal concern with religious experience, psychological analysis, and getting ahead in the world; a strong animal sexuality and a strong egotism; and driving energy. . . . Donne's poetry triumphs by virtue of its limitations. Energies which might otherwise have been diffused over wide areas of consciousness have been channeled and caught into a tight constriction which makes them operate with brilliance and intensity.

Mr. Hunt's technique of close reading proves to be a surface discipline, one which is very well managed in places, but through which a lack of sympathetic imagination impatiently obtrudes. Though he makes efforts to divide his conclusions from his inductions, a liberal indulgence of amateur psychologizing slips into the process. We have much made of Donne's Catholicism (he does not persuade me), of Donne's isolation from the "dominant temper of the Elizabethan period," of the intricacy of the stanzas, of the microcosm symbol as obsession, of the greater personal revelation of the poems than the personal letters, etc. But psychological biography requires a pattern of continuity not demonstrable as that of the poems yet hard to keep out of one's reading of the poems. (See page 72, for instance, or 88, where the allegedly unfinished business of the poem is induced from the letters.) Less important, but annoying, the psychologizing grows bold on its unopposed victories. Mr. Hunt does not hesitate to give us a comparative reading of Joyce's soul, or St. Paul's (a tactless performance).

His fixed concepts of religious propriety, of poetic sensuousness, of verse music—all alienate him from the esthetic object he is examining. To speak of the last: all any listener has to say is, "I don't hear it," and the precarious art vanishes—or the judge disqualifies himself to others' ears. No art can resist blindness and deafness, and the

precedents of court failures bear more authority than any known code. Mr. Hunt is indifferent to whole positive ranges of Donne's music and feeling; but he makes no disciplined effort either to learn from or to argue against those who do respond; instead, he arranges his own argument, and he is not seldom a little crude in his negative judgments. See, for instance, pages 112 and 132-33 for the forced comparison with the "rich, Miltonic orchestration": if Donne had been a better poet, he presumably would have written a poem more like Milton's than his own. On pages 5 and 6 Mr. Hunt commits himself to specific metrical remarks which are incorrect in an elementary way and seriously embarrass his qualifications to pass judgment on the more difficult properties of verse music. Before graduating to his more ambitious analysis he needed to know that only the first line in each stanza of "The Indifferent" is trochaic.¹

Mr. Hunt's basic error is a fatal one: misreading the spirit of the work. The consequence of this, inevitably, is the posing of wrong questions. The more faithfully relevant the answers are, the less they can enlighten us. To assist him, Mr. Hunt produces norms, and to avoid prejudice, Elizabethan norms. Here is a sample answer: Donne lacks "the ecstatic romanticism with which Spenser idealizes physical passion . . . the delight of sense in lilies and violets, silken curtains, and odored sheets . . . the blissful physical relaxation of sensuality." Here are other answers: "There are few gardens in his verse," no "romantic response to myth" or to antiquity; nor "does Donne seem ever to have experienced anything like the Mystic Rapture." "Moreover, one looks in vain through all the appeals to coy mistresses . . . for the characteristic Renaissance effect of the *carpe diem* theme." (These are shocking, but not, I think, because I am quoting out of context; in the context of the norms they are not less irrelevant to the understanding of what Donne's poetry is.) The game is easier to play than to stop, and one is not always sure that Mr. Hunt himself believes in the charges he methodically sweeps together. It is a risky game for the critic, unless he be : Dr. Johnson and can outface risk and make his imaginative failures more enlightening than the easy successes of ordinary critics.

University of Washington

ARNOLD STEIN

Robert Wentworth Rogers, *The Major Satires of Alexander Pope* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1955. ix + 163 pp. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, 40).

THE heart of Mr. Rogers' book is contained in three chapters which examine in turn the *Dunciad Variorum*, *An Essay on Man* and the *Ethic Epistles*, and the *Imitations of Horace*. Each of these chapters moves from a consideration of the historical circumstances surrounding the composition and publication of the work in question to a consideration of the work's content and artistic merit and of its place in Pope's later literary career. These chapters are preceded by one called "Incentives to Satire," which attempts to describe the shift in Pope's literary interests in the mid 1720's, and are followed by one called "Warburton and the Later Satiric Mode," which is a brief history of the last years of Pope's literary life. There are several useful appendices: some of Pope's publication agreements are printed for the first time, there are some early manuscript readings of the *Dunciad* deriving from marginalia by Jonathan Richardson the younger, and there is a check-list of Popeiana printed in England between 1728 and 1744.

The Major Satires of Alexander Pope is in many ways an extremely useful book, for it gathers under one cover most of what recent scholars have discovered about the composition and publication of Pope's later poetry. But Mr. Rogers has not added in any very important way to what is already known and in print; he may occasionally "round off" or "fill in" the picture, but most of the time the reader is on familiar ground. His accounts of the genesis and publication of the poems differ only in minor detail from the parallel accounts in the Introductions to the various volumes of the Twickenham Edition of Pope's Works. Mr. Rogers may quote on occasion a previously unpublished letter, or cite a different contemporary criticism of Pope, or bring to attention a manuscript variant not hitherto published, but his research on the whole has been confined to the sources explored by the Twickenham editors. One is aware throughout that the author has gone to primary sources and that his scholarship has been energetic and sound; one is aware also that he has confirmed in the main what is already well known.

A criticism somewhat similar to the above can be leveled at Mr. Rogers when he examines Pope's work on more aesthetic grounds. That he admires Pope's ethical perspectives and poetic genius is evident throughout his book. There are lapses in his perceptions (for example, his idea that Pope in his poetry before the 1720's

"was interested in art primarily for art's sake"), but on the whole his critical comments are sound, and there are times when he is very sensitive to poetic effects. At the same time no excitement is generated. His account of Pope's achievement in *An Essay on Man* hardly compares with the vibrant discussion of the same poem to be found in the Twickenham Edition. His criticism is not sharp and detailed; neither is it rich in its suggestions. What one gets on the whole is a rather rambling, if sophisticated, "appreciation" of Pope's genius.

Mr. Rogers in the last few years has contributed much that has been of value to Pope scholars. His Harvard dissertation is cited by Maynard Mack in his Twickenham volume, and James Sutherland in his revised edition of the Twickenham *Dunciad* is indebted to him for clearing up some of the circumstances surrounding the early printing and copyright of the *Dunciad*. Perhaps the trouble is that his present work was delayed too long, and comes as an anti-climax to much of recent scholarship and criticism. One can only regret that Mr. Rogers was not more ambitious: the "Later Career" of Alexander Pope is yet to be written, and one wonders why he did not attempt such a full-length biographical study. Into it he could have woven almost all of the material in his present work. He could also have placed us all heavily in his debt.

The Major Satires of Alexander Pope will be found a most useful reference work and should be made available to students. The criticisms of Mr. Rogers' book which have been made here should not be allowed to obscure this important fact.

Yale University

AUBREY L. WILLIAMS

R. P. Parkin, *The Poetic Workmanship of Alexander Pope* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1955. 239 pp.). BEARING in mind Sainte-Beuve's advice that we should try to imagine what a great writer would think of us and of the spirit in which we approach him, let us imagine how the author of *The Dunciad* might react to a study of his work beginning, "Alexander Pope's poetry can be a specific against the prevailing intellectual and spiritual disorder of our times on two levels—the semantic and the technical." He might recall the redoubtable critic

whose unweary'd pains
Made Horace dull, and humbled Milton's strains.
Turn what they will to Verse, their toil is vain,
Critics like me shall make it Prose again.

Certainly this opening sentence, with its blend of editorial cliché and pedantry and its solemnity of tone, hardly suggests that the writer is happily equipped to deal with a poet remarkable for urbanity and lightness of touch.

Let it be said at once that we have no quarrel with Mrs. Parkin's insistence on Pope's moral seriousness. (*The Dunciad* shows how hard it is to combat such solemnity without becoming equally solemn). But as Mrs. Parkin points out, Pope's moral sense and his sense of the ironic are in the best of his poetry inseparable. Although Mrs. Parkin tells us more than once that this is so, her statements are continually being undercut by her practice, above all by the tone adopted in analyzing particular passages. Few readers, I believe, will be enticed by this book to enter into Pope's game of wit,—a serious limitation in a work apparently addressed to a non-specialized audience.

The inappropriateness of tone is worth noting because as always it points to more serious limitations. An example from the chapter on irony will show where solemnity leads. Here is the comment on the well-known couplet from the imitation of Horace's Satire I of Book II:

[Dread]

From furious *Sappho* scarce a milder Fate,

P—x'd by her Love, or libell'd by her Hate . . .

The ironical accident here is situational rather than, as in the passage previously cited, primarily verbal. *Sappho* injures where she hates, which is the normal and expected outcome. But by the irony of fate, even where she loves she injures. This couplet, half libel and half lament, opens a window upon the universe. It permits the reader to glimpse the working of an awesome and unalterable law: the just and exact retribution for crime. "Furious" *Sappho's* crime was venereal. Consequently, her punishment is, in both a physical and a spiritual sense, venereal.

This interpretation does indeed "open a window upon the universe." But if we approach the lines with less unction and more respect for the relevant context, we may conclude that the critic has opened the wrong window:

Slander or Poyson, dread from *Delia's* Rage,
Hard Words or Hanging, if your Judge be *Page*
From furious *Sappho* scarce a milder Fate,
P—x'd by her Love, or libell'd by her Hate:
Its proper Pow'r to hurt, each Creature feels,
Bulls aim their horns, and Asses lift their heels,
'Tis a Bear's Talent not to kick, but hug,

And no man wonders he's not stung by Pug:
So drink with *Waters*, or with *Chartres* eat,
They'll never poison you, they'll only cheat.

The moral of the whole passage, as the original lines in Horace indicate, is that "each creature" exercises "its proper power" or "talent," that Delia, Sappho, and others follow the general rule and behave just as we should expect them to. What we glimpse is not the law of "retribution for crime," but the harsh truth that all creatures will act according to their nature. The attitude expressed is hardly "awesome"; it is rather one of wryly amused, tranquil acceptance: the poet will nevertheless go on "rhyming and painting" such persons in his verse. Of course the universe breaks in, but only as the lightest and most remote of overtones. "Creature" probably does imply "creation." But the echo of the universe is heard in an atmosphere of bravado and intimate gossip. ("You and I know how these people behave.")

Perhaps the reviewer may be accused of breaking a butterfly upon a wheel, or of being uncharitable to a first book, one that shows a commendable desire to deal with Pope's poetry as poetry. But at the risk of seeming earnest or comically obtuse, it must be said that *The Poetic Workmanship of Alexander Pope*, as a fairly typical specimen of the new academic criticism, does give one pause. The "critical" thesis or book is happily becoming more common in academic circles. But to produce a truly critical work imposes rigorous demands on a young writer-scholar, demands of a sort that cannot be met by simply following a method. The scholar who aspires to be "that god-like thing, a literary critic," as Housman once put it, must be by nature more perceptive, more talented as a writer, blessed with a richer experience of men and manners than the "researcher." He must be indeed

More wise, more learn'd, more just, more ev'rything.

Otherwise, his book may prove less enlightening to students of literature than the work of the merest dictionary drudge.

The present example shows some of the weaknesses encouraged by the so-called "critical" approach as it is now being practiced in American universities. Mrs. Parkin's treatment of Pope follows a familiar mode: she analyzes the text in terms of various "rhetorical elements": "dramatic speaker," "paradox," "parallelism," "metaphor," and so on. But Mrs. Parkin's use of this method—not neces-

sarily objectionable in itself—is not free from the familiar defect of equating the poetry with the devices that produce it. The elaborate apparatus might be justified or forgiven if the accompanying readings were either particularly novel or subtle, but as the sample quoted above indicates, this is too seldom the case.

The many critical terms—repeated with maddening frequency—give a first impression of clarity in method and precision. But some of the more important terms, for example, “humor” and “tension,” are given almost no formal definition, and the definition by use is far from satisfactory. “Tension” is applied so loosely and variously as to cover any sensation of contrast between the elements of a poem from dramatic speakers to syntactical arrangements to moral positions. What the examples have in common that is called “tension” is not clear. “Parallelism,” a term used first of grammatical and rhetorical patterns, is later applied—perhaps by a slip of the mind—to “parallelism in God,” which seems to refer to the Creator’s impartial view of all that lies within the Great Chain of Being. The use of the latter expression illustrates another weakness, the attaching of abstract labels to an example as a substitute for explanation. As usual nowadays, the Great Chain is much over-worked,—an indication of the limited, conventional range of the learning displayed in this volume. In two chapters that are potentially very interesting, on Genre and on Imitation, the treatment suffers from lack of a fuller and more precise account of the ancient forms or works to which Mrs. Parkin refers in discussing Pope’s heroic and Horatian poems. Often in working through these earnest and systematic pages, the reader cries out for one halfpennyworth of fact or fun to this intolerable deal of analysis! There is indeed too little analysis in the best sense, too few sentences where the writer deftly points out a particular use of words while defining and evoking exactly the quality of experience they express. But criticism at that level cannot be produced by thoroughness alone or by following any systematic scheme of enlightenment.

Harvard University

REUBEN A. BROWER

Helen Gill Viljoen, *Ruskin's Scottish Heritage: A Prelude* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1956. [viii] + 284 pp. 16 plates. \$3.75). ALTHOUGH Ruskin’s works have yet to receive the attention they deserve, his life continues to be a tempting subject for biographers. All of them have drawn heavily upon *Praeterita* and the biographical

introductions to Cook and Wedderburn's monumental Library Edition of the *Works*, generally considered the fullest and most reliable contemporary accounts of Ruskin's career. In her "Prelude" to a projected biography Professor Viljoen openly challenges the reliability of both sources. By documenting their factual errors, their distortions, their suppressions, she convincingly demonstrates that they no longer ought to be accepted without question.

More than twenty-five years ago she began to collect data for a biography that would make no use of these sources, except when her own findings supported them. According to the author's account, she examined and transcribed more unpublished Ruskin manuscripts and Ruskiniana than any person alive. In addition, she enlisted the services of a host of amateur and professional investigators—genealogists, librarians, clergymen, registrars, curators—who have combed through archives and parish registers both in England and Scotland.

Ruskin's Scottish Heritage contains the first fruits of this research. More than half the volume is given over to a long introduction, elaborate notes, bibliography, index, and three appendices, which include transcripts of family wills as well as a detailed chronological record (with sources) of births, baptisms, marriages, and deaths. The volume as a whole greatly enlarges our knowledge of Ruskin's ancestry and puts what we already knew on a much firmer foundation. For example, the author has traced Ruskin's great-great-grandfather, John Ruskin of Cheshunt, and has discovered that Ruskin's maternal grandfather was not Captain Cox of Yarmouth but William Cock, a Croydon tavern keeper. Of the more than eighty names on the Ruskin family tree in this volume, ninety percent show some addition or correction; nearly a third of the entries appear for the first time. The author's research has also enabled her to revise and augment the standard biographical accounts of Ruskin's parents. She believes that their attitudes were largely shaped by a sense of their social inferiority. John James, Ruskin's father, emerges as more of a snob than ever. Because he was never able to forget that his father had been a grocer and his own wife the daughter of a tavern keeper, he was determined to have his son become a gentleman. By contrast, the author treats Margaret Ruskin far more sympathetically than have other biographers. She apparently suffered much at the hands of her unstable and willful uncle, in whose household she lived. Although her health gave way under the strain of his attempts to break off her prolonged engagement to his son, John James, she bore her tribulations with remarkable fortitude.

Since this volume is intended as a "Prelude" to a definitive biography, it ought to meet rather rigorous standards. Unfortunately, it contains serious defects of manner, treatment, and style. First, the author has unwisely thought fit to write an introduction in which she extols her own work and attacks almost all her predecessors. Had she been content to demonstrate the danger of accepting uncritically statements by Ruskin, Cook, and Wedderburn, her analysis would have been unexceptionable. But she goes much further and belligerently insists that all those responsible for the Library Edition were motivated primarily by greed. She attacks the editors for their lack of scholarship and imaginative insight, their "unpardonable haste" (thirty-nine volumes in nine years), and their suppression of material that they believed might damage Ruskin. She also accuses them of "victimizing" Ruskin, preparing "a gigantic trap" for his biographers, and even lying. It is regrettable that the Library Edition is imperfect, but its errors can be accounted for without having to imply that its editors were reprobates. After all, these same greedy, hasty, unscholarly, and untruthful men produced what is still by far the finest collected edition of any Victorian.

Professor Viljoen treats Ruskin's biographers with almost equal contempt. Because they unwittingly repeat errors in the Library Edition, they stand accused of writing hastily to "sell." The author points out that they could easily have avoided their errors had they taken the time to examine "public records available to all." By "haste" she apparently means their reluctance to devote twenty-five years to locating "available" public records. One biographer, however, is largely exempt from attack: W. G. Collingwood, to whose memory this book is dedicated. When Cook repeats one of Collingwood's blunders, Professor Viljoen calls it Cook's error, not Collingwood's. When Cook errs, she accuses him of "garbling and confusing evidence which (as so often) he had only half digested"; she attributes Collingwood's mistakes to his desire to write "picturesquely," "well knowing what would please Ruskin."

Part of the weakness of the book stems from the fact that its subject is altogether too slight to justify an entire volume. As a result, the author has been tempted to include far too many insignificant details as well as lengthy digressions, which not only are unnecessary but often obscure essential facts. For instance, there are detailed explanations of the difference between a tavern and an inn, a grocer and a merchant. Repetitions abound. The author points out no less

than ten times that the maiden name of Ruskin's mother was originally Cock, not Cox, and even gratuitously explains why Miss Cock chose to change her name.

Another limitation is the author's inability to give life to her material. Although she speaks of revealing character in all its complexity, most of Ruskin's ancestors remain little more than skeletons. Even her analysis of John James Ruskin, the central figure in the book, hardly goes beyond repeating over and over his admission that he lacked self-respect.

The author's style also markedly detracts from the value of her book. Sprawling sentences disfigure almost every page. They are often so loaded with qualifications and parentheses that they, and the reader, buckle under the weight. A representative sentence reads: "Not unrelatedly, these new biographers would express the iconoclasm of a period when not the qualities reflected in significant achievement but, instead, the vulnerabilities (real or supposed) of erstwhile heroes could best satisfy the spirit of a time that also fostered challenge to age-old values in our civilization, particularly those concerned with love and with religion—many of these values, beyond that rationalistic Waste-land of the twenties, to be contemptuously stigmatized 'Victorian.'" The sentence which follows this one is more than twice as long and far more tortuous.

Despite these flaws, scholars should be grateful for the facts Professor Viljoen has given them. When a definitive biography of Ruskin finally appears, its author is certain to be indebted to her for having cleared the ground and pointed the way. In the meantime, no one seriously interested in Ruskin's family background can afford to ignore this volume.

The University of Illinois Press is to be commended for having produced an unusually handsome book at a remarkably low price.

University of Minnesota

S. O. A. ULLMANN

G. Turville-Petre, *Origins of Icelandic Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. xii + 260 pp.). THE contents of this book are accurately summarized as follows on its covers: "The author surveys the prose and verse of Iceland from the oldest time down to the classical age of Snorri. In an introductory chapter he considers the poetry of pagan Iceland—Eddaic and skaldic—and discusses its origins. He turns later to the prose literature of the twelfth century,

showing some of the foreign models which inspired it and the social conditions under which it developed. He pays especial attention to the religious literature of the early period, and describes the oldest Kings' Sagas, Sagas of Bishops, and synoptic histories in some detail. In an epilogue the author very briefly discusses the classical prose of the thirteenth century, attempting to show of what kind its sources were, and how it was related to the prose and verse of the preceding ages."

With this book the author, who formerly wrote the *Heroic Age of Scandinavia*, takes his place in the foremost ranks of those who have written about Icelandic literature in England.

He starts by a study of the origin of the Old Icelandic poetry, Eddic and skaldic. To this task he combines two skills not too common in Icelandic scholars: a thorough familiarity with medieval Latin and an ability to read Irish. Because of his knowledge of Irish, he decides that the skaldic poetry arose through Irish influence, its inventor being Bragi skáld, whom he, with Guðbrandur Vigfússon dates to 850-900. Since Heusler no one has dared to advocate Irish origins for the skaldic poetry, as tempting as it might seem, considering the similarities in methods and aims of the two poetic groups. In this book the author makes no attempt to prove his case but refers to a paper "Ireland and the Poets of Iceland," read to the Oxford University Celtic Society on May 28, 1951. This paper may still be unpublished, but an Icelandic translation of it has appeared in *Skirnir* (1954). His arguments are very plausible as to the principles (syllable counting, strophic poetry, internal rimes and assonances), yet it seems to me that he has not been able to produce the expected metre, an exact counterpart to the skaldic *dróttkvætt*, or other skaldic meters. His identification of *hrynhent* with Latin hymn meters had already been done by Heusler and others. Turville-Peter actually believes that the *prímssignr* Egill Skalla-Grímsson learned his *runhent* rimed meter from the rimed hymns of the church rather than from the similar rimed poetry in Old English. I still feel that it is more likely that Egill learned from Old English, which he would understand rather than from the Latin hymns, although I have recently found a Latin hymn which would be an exact pattern for both (*Sancte sator/suffragatur*).

There was a time when scholars thought that Icelandic sagas, like Pallas Athene from the head of Zeus, leapt full-grown from the mouths of saga-tellers to be written down by clerks when the ecclesiastical art

of writing had progressed enough to do so. Echoes of this view about the sagas are found in Henry Osborn Taylor's *Medieval Mind*, the great German scholar Andreas Heusler was very close to this opinion, and it was the theme of *The Origin of the Family Sagas* (1930) by the Norwegian folklorist, Knut Liestøl. This was based on the misconception that the sagas dated from the twelfth century.

During the thirties and forties Icelandic scholars, notably Sigurður Nordal and his pupils, editors of *Íslensk Fornrit*, gradually demonstrated the falseness of this picture. Far from being the oldest, the family sagas were direct descendants of the kings' sagas, which in turn had roots in medieval chronicles (*Ari inn fróði*) and in hagiography (*Ólafs saga helga*). But though lots of homilies, saints' lives, apostle legends, and Mary legends had been published, few scholars dealing with the sagas had catholic enough tastes and wide enough schooling in medieval ecclesiastical literature to make fruitful investigations of these matters. Icelandic libraries are very poor in this field.

Professor Turville-Petre does not only have this catholic taste for sagas as well as hagiography, but as a Catholic scholar he has decidedly the advantage over his heretic fellow-workers in his great familiarity with the Latin literature of the Mother Church from which the sagas grew, however heretic in appearance manner and spirit.

Professor Turville-Petre has these wise words to say about the early religious prose of Iceland:

"Such literature has often been neglected in popular studies of Icelandic literature and even in authoritative works. This is easy to understand, and it is excusable. The saints' lives and homilies are not among the best or most interesting of Icelandic literature. Only occasionally do they express the thoughts and the artistic taste of the Icelandic people, and they tell little about the traditions and the antiquities of the north. But they were more important for the Icelanders of the twelfth century than they are for us. They were the first written biographies which the Icelanders came to know. The Icelanders learned from them how biographies and wondertales could be written in books. Thus they helped the Icelanders to develop a literary style in their own language and gave them the means to express their own thoughts through the medium of letters. In a word, the learned literature did not teach the Icelanders what to think or what to say, but it taught them how to say it. It is unlikely that the sagas of kings and of Icelanders, or even sagas of ancient heroes, would have developed as they did unless several generations of Ice-

landers had first been trained in hagiographic narrative." Turville-Petre ignores the oral traditions as a matter of principle, because they are quite intangible. Nevertheless, it might be added here that no amount of hagiographic training could have produced the above-mentioned works without a strong native oral tradition behind them.

In a work of this size lots of details might be questionable or disputable, but in general the work is obviously done with great care. Translating (on p. 3) *austmaðr*, a nickname, I would have preferred Eastman to Ostman, and this person was probably not a Gautr but a Gauti. But I shall limit my comments to one detail more, the account (on p. 173) of Haraldr inn hárfagri's Lappish witch-wife Snæfriðr (Snow-Fair). Says Turville-Petre: "This passage, rich in motifs of wandering folk-tale, was copied by Snorri almost word for word and included in the *Heimskringla*. It is not surprising that Snorri should admire its style, for mannered as it is, the mannerisms are used tastefully." Now, I have no doubt that Snorri admired the story of Snæfriðr, but I think the style must have struck him as queer, as it strikes a reader used to the sagastyle. Why otherwise did he himself not indulge in rhythmical alliterative prose, balanced sentences and epigrams? Turville-Petre will of course ask, why did he not change the style? It must remain a matter of opinion.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

Hieronymus Emser, *Eyn deutsche satyra*, ed. Robert T. Clark, Jr. (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1956. 43 pp. *Texte des späten Mittelalters*, 3). THIS is the third in the new series *Texte des späten Mittelalters*, and is very much in line with the objectives of the series. The poem presented is the work of the young Emser (1505), written for the court of Saxony where the poet was employed. The subject matter is innocuous, the style mediocre, the poem itself—*eyn deutsche Satyra vnd straffe des Eebruchs vnnnd in was würden vnnnd erenn der Eelich stand vorzeiten gehalten, mit erklärung vil schoner historien*—of interest mainly as the product of a man who was later to gain renown in another field. In style and treatment, the poem is a cut above the *Meistersinger* niveau of the period, but falls far short of being a work of art. Emser rarely manages to create memorable lines; actually, he probably never intended to since the poem is primarily didactic. The one section worthy of mention is the treatment of the tale of Orpheus

and Euridice. Here (e. g. ll. 316 ff.) the writer becomes a poet and allows himself free rein, swinging into the forms and content of *Minnesang*: (" . . wo ist mein gsell, / mein trost, mein hord, mein ougenweid? / Vnd wer es allen lüfeln leid, / si wil ich sie doch schen an / vnd mit ir an ir syten gan"). This is not perhaps the quality of song one might expect from Orpheus, but for Emser it is pretty good. Another amusing touch is the *interpretatio christiana* whereby the inhabitants of Hades compare Orpheus' playing to the music they heard before their fall from grace—a marginal note explains later: *Pluto ist als vil als Lucifer*. For the rest, the poem is pretty pedestrian, but interesting from a historical point of view.

Prof. Clark has produced an excellent text, rarely departing from his source, and listing all changes in the footnotes. Difficult words and passages are explained to facilitate reading; the punctuation is modernized, which is probably just as well; the text is readable without sacrificing authenticity. The editor's comments are sound, only in a few places is there room for a difference of opinion. Perhaps the most gratifying aspect of the edition is that the editor does not claim to know more than the poet.

Emser's language shows Swabian and Saxon traces which Clark explains very well. He neglects to some extent the Swiss influences (cf. *gsein* as participle—line 335 and footnote to 379). In any event, it is not wise to ascribe too much dialectal significance to the various forms, since Emser uses a mixture of dialects according to the exigencies of rhyme and meter, without much attention to consistency—a practice common to the time.

Like other studies in the series, this volume strikes off in a hitherto neglected direction, a direction which both Stammer and Schirokauer pointed out several years ago. It is refreshing to see work done outside the too often plowed fields of the *Blütezeit*. The criticism might be raised that valuable time is being spent on inferior works, but who is to judge inferiority or superiority if the texts are not generally available? This edition and the series in which it appears are most certainly to be welcomed.

U. S. Information Service,
Calcutta

THOMAS PERRY THORNTON

Werner Kohlschmidt, *Form und Innerlichkeit. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Wirkung der deutschen Klassik und Romantik* (Bern: Francke, 1955. 269 pp. Sammlung Dalp, 81). THIS latest volume in the Dalp series comprises ten essays by Professor Kohlschmidt of the University of Bern on a variety of topics and figures from Winckelmann to Stifter and Mörike. All but one of the essays have appeared in European journals, eight of them between 1948 and 1953. The hitherto unpublished article, an essay on Winckelmann, is the author's "Berliner Antrittsvorlesung" delivered in 1955. For present publication the essays have been arranged chronologically with respect to topics. Regrettably, notes have been relegated to the back of the book and there are no key numbers in the text itself to draw the attention of the reader to them. Other than this, the format of the work leaves nothing to be desired—the print is clear and of a very legible size; printing errors are almost nonexistent.

The title chosen for this collection of essays—written for the specialist in eighteenth and nineteenth century literature—expresses the author's concern with problems of both poetic language and *Geistesgeschichte*. His method is in each case the same—an analysis of the writers' views and purpose as these are revealed in their language. Conclusions are invariably carefully supported by detailed textual analysis. However, Professor Kohlschmidt's concern is with more than his immediate topic. He seeks to show the existence of a common tradition and continuity of ideas that binds together Classicism, Romanticism and Poetic Realism. There is thus an inner relationship between such apparently unrelated topics as the interpretation of Goethe's *Pandora* and the discussion of Novalis' language of inwardness.

In his opening essay Professor Kohlschmidt seeks to correct the traditional image of Winckelmann as a completely independent thinker and critic by showing the extent to which Baroque influences of which Winckelmann himself was not conscious determined to a considerable degree his interpretation of Greek art and culture. In Kohlschmidt's eyes Winckelmann is "eine Uebergangsgestalt . . . mit unausgeglichenen Widersprüchen . . . in der geistigen Haltung und im Reflektieren . . . mehr dem Barockjahrhundert verpflichtet, als man gemeinhin wahrnimmt" (p. 32). Three essays on Goethe's Nausikaa fragment and *Pandora* are primarily concerned to show how subjective elements determined the poet's use of Greek myth in his works and with his *Griechentum*. In the convincing "Klassische Walpurgisnacht und

Erlösungsmysterium in *Faust II*" the author demonstrates that Goethe, while consistently distinguishing between Greek and Christian traditions, nevertheless presupposes a relationship between the daemonic roots of both and seeks to reveal the depths of feeling where these shared roots have their growth. The sixth essay brings a valuable discussion of Novalis' language of inwardness and shows, through analysis of the poet's metaphor, how spiritualization of the physical world and introspection play increasingly greater rôles in his poetry. The most exciting of the studies, in the opinion of the reviewer, is "Nihilismus der Romantik," in which Professor Kohlschmidt examines this often overlooked negative aspect of the Romantic movement. The remaining three essays deal with specific problems in the work of Eichendorff, Stifter and Mörike—"Die symbolische Formelhaftigkeit von Eichendorffs Prosastil"; "Leben und Tod in Stifters *Studien*"; "Wehmut, Erinnerung, Sehnsucht in Mörikes Gedicht"—yet are linked to the other essays in their treatment of related problems.

Despite the general excellence of Professor Kohlschmidt's studies, the work suffers from certain faults. The chief weakness of the individual analyses is an often rigid and dogmatic interpretation of certain passages. I might cite in illustration Kohlschmidt's quoting as an example of Novalis' language of inwardness "Ich lebe und webe in der frischen Herbstluft und neue Ströme von Lebenslust fliessen in mich mit jedem Atemzuge." This hyperbolic metaphor (in a letter to Schiller) scarcely warrants the comment: "Als unerschöpflich Beschenktes und Erweitertes geht durch die Richtungsbestimmung das Innere des Ichs hervor. In diesem Fall bereichert und ergänzt durch von aussen einströmende Kräfte" (p. 127). Too, Professor Kohlschmidt's method of supporting his arguments by the most profuse documentation is at times somewhat tedious. Finally, it must be regretted that the author did not see fit to edit his essays for this publication with a view to giving us a work more homogeneous in character. One is constantly reminded that these are essays originally independently conceived. The book would have profited greatly from minor revisions making for smoother transition from one essay to the next and from the elimination of certain repetitions and superfluousities such as the identification of Rudolf Haym (p. 158), surely not necessary in so specialized a work.

Kenyon College

BRUCE HAYWOOD

William Rose, *Heinrich Heine. Two Studies of his Thought and Feeling* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. vii + 163 pp. \$2.90).

IN his first study Professor Rose follows Heine's political and social ideas in their development from his early student days until his death. He finds that he was always a liberal without a very clear discernment of economic and even political principles and with peculiar biases and prejudices, as the one against England, a country whose liberties he recognized but did not quite understand in their specific character. In spite of such limitations he instinctively had some remarkable insights which led him to utter prophesies that proved true in the course of events. He was often carried away by new ideas but rectified his valuations according to later observation. He was too impatient to convert acquired convictions into reality, even by force, although his intelligence contradicted such procedure. In regard to communism, his attitude was divided: he feared it might be unavoidably victorious in the end since it made sense to him rationally, but he hated the thought of its success since it would destroy all culture and beauty of life with its egalitarianism.

The study is very valuable because it analyzes clearly the often zigzagging course of Heine's theories and convictions, which were, as, for instance, in his relation to Börne, dictated often more by emotional reaction than by cool reflection and strongly colored by his estheticism. One of the constants, Heine's idea of the dichotomy of Hellenism and Nazarenism, which permeates all his thinking practically throughout his life, seems especially well characterized.

Striking passages are quoted by Mr. Rose in felicitous renderings, which seem even more important and effectively used in the second essay on "Heine's Jewish Feeling." In spite of so many contradictory statements of the poet concerning Christianity and Judaism, Professor Rose succeeds in stressing the positive valuations and their importance. The tribute Heine pays to the Bible as a source of inspiration to himself and to his people, yes, to humanity, and his paean on Moses are not only literary masterpieces but they should be remembered as important documents in the correct interpretation of his religious and philosophical credo.

I missed the mention of Heine's premature birth as a cause of his constant embarrassment and of his inferiority complex. If it is a fact, it certainly played a part in the evasiveness of his statements at baptism and contributed to the confusions and contradictions of his

immediate and later reactions to this official act, which seems in some way linked up with his illegitimate conception.

An index not only of names but of ideas and problems as well facilitates the use of the book.

Goucher College

ERNST FEISE

Maria Bindschedler, *Nietzsche und die poetische Lüge* (Basel: Verlag für Recht und Gesellschaft, 1954. 88 pp. Philosophische Forschungen, 14). IN her stimulating little book *Nietzsche und die poetische Lüge*, Miss Bindschedler discusses Nietzsche's highly ambivalent and frequently changing attitudes towards truth and falsehood. The word "poetic" in the title does not do justice to the scope of her study. For though we learn much about Nietzsche's views concerning poetry and the arts, the real topic is not truth versus poetic illusion but truth as opposed to all the products of the creative imagination of man; "*Nietzsche und die schöpferische Lüge*" would perhaps have been a more appropriate title.

Since knowing the truth would amount to knowing what really is, it is impossible to divorce the problem of truth from that of being. Nietzsche, who had sought truth stubbornly throughout his life, was forced at last to come to the conclusion that being (*Sein*) as well as all the other concepts we hold dear are mere words to which nothing corresponds in fact. If we agree with the late Nietzsche that the very concept of something (that which is) owes its origin to an attempt to overpower primeval chaos, to create a semblance of order, of permanence, of being in the totally unknowable real world of eternal flux, and if, like Nietzsche, we are willing to define the "will to power" as a will to "something," we shall no longer be able to speak of the truth of a proposition in terms of a correspondence to something that really is, but must admit that it is strictly impossible either to know or to state the truth. Moreover, we are not able to say, of course, what the will to power is, for this very question implies that the will to power both is and is something, whereas in Nietzsche's own terms it can neither be nor be something: that to which the concept of something owes its origin cannot "itself" be something. Because all we can ever say is "something," we shall never be able to say anything. Nietzsche must have felt this dilemma when he, as Miss Bindschedler points out in her interesting chapter "*Der Wille zur Macht*," dissolved the will into what he called "*Willens-Punkta-*

tionen": "Es gibt keinen Willen: es gibt Willens-Punktationen, die beständig ihre Macht mehrten oder verlieren. . . ." But these "Willens-Punktationen" can have no more substantial reality than, say, the atoms of the scientists, to which in a sense they correspond and of whose fictitious character Nietzsche was quite aware. The truth is that we state a lie each time we say that something is, be this something a mere atom or a "Punktation." This is the case notwithstanding the fact that the proposition "something is" is implied in every rational utterance man has ever made, even in the statements "something is not" or "nothing is." The tragedy of those who thirst for knowledge is a linguistic one. Nietzsche was too optimistic when he stated resignedly: "Wir können nur eine Welt *begreifen*, die wir selber *gemacht* haben"; we shall never be able to *comprehend* the world we have made, at best we can hope to glean from a study of the syntax of the sentences which we produce and which have produced us and our world *how*, according to what principles, we manufacture our lies, and why, as long as we speak, we cannot help lying. The whole world, as Nietzsche came to see it, was a "poetic," a creative lie, "something" we ourselves have constructed and which has no validity except a purely verbal or subjective one; to study the deceitful structure of reality would be the ultimate task of the science of linguistics.

It is not surprising that Nietzsche, who insisted on knowing even at the price of finding out that nothing could be known, should at times have felt deeply suspicious of the poets and all those who, as it appeared to him, were liars by profession and invented ideal "Hinterwelten" because they were either too dishonest or too weak to face the "truth." Miss Bindschedler speaks of this in her chapter "Der Dichter als Lügner": "Es ist das unheroische Bedürfnis des Menschen nach Schein, Lüge, Trost, welches ihn eine metaphysische Welt ersinnen lässt, wo ihm der fatale Anblick des Daseins selbst nicht erträglich ist." It need hardly be pointed out that Nietzsche's war against what he called "Dichter-Erschleichnis" was in the last analysis nothing but a relentless castigation of the poet, the artist, the metaphysician within his own breast, of his own creative urges and religious yearnings.

The will to construct, to produce, to create was as strongly developed in Nietzsche as his desire to get at the truth and to state it without distortions. Whenever these creative instincts gained the upper hand in his life and thought, the word "truth," as he used it, would take

on an entirely different meaning. It is in his *Wille zur Macht* that this second kind of truth, not the truth of what really is but the "truth" inherent in the creative process itself, finds its fullest expression. "Der Wille zur Wahrheit ist ein Fest-machen, ein Wahr-, Dauerhaft-machen, ein Aus-dem-Auge-schaffen jenes falschen Charakters" (der wirklichen, stets werdenden Welt)¹ "eine Umdeutung desselben ins Seiende. 'Wahrheit' ist somit nicht etwas, das da wäre und das aufzufinden, zu entdecken wäre,—sondern etwas, das zu schaffen ist und den Namen für einen Prozess abgibt, mehr noch für einen Willen der Überwältigung, der an sich kein Ende hat: Wahrheit hineinlegen, als ein processus in infinitum, ein aktives Bestimmen,—nicht ein Bewusstwerden von etwas, das an sich fest und bestimmt wäre. Es ist ein Wort für den 'Willen zur Macht.'" The will produces truth. But the truth which it produces, the illusion that something actually is, is a lie. Nietzsche's "Wille zur Macht" is here revealed as a "Wille zur Lüge" and this "Wille zur Lüge" as the only and ultimate truth to which the human mind can penetrate. The lie which the will produces, the fiction that something is, the "fingierte Welt von Subjekt, Substanz, 'Vernunft' usw. ist nötig" for the maintenance and continuance of life. Therefore it is true in yet another sense: in that of Goethe's: "Was fruchtbar ist, allein ist wahr." "Nietzsche hat die zweite Art der 'Wahrheit' vor Augen, wo immer er die Kunst rechtfertigt, möge diese Rechtfertigung im Namen der Götter Dionysos und Apollo oder aber . . . im Namen des Willens zur Macht erfolgen." In Nietzsche's *Wille zur Macht* the artistic, constructive, creative instincts of man find their most powerful affirmation.

If the reader keeps in mind this twofold interpretation to which Nietzsche's concept of truth lends itself, he will find his way more easily through Miss Bindschedler's penetrating study. The chapters "Das philologische Ideal," "Der Dichter als Lügner," and "Das Wesen des Künstlers" show us how Nietzsche rejected the poetic lie in the name of a truth which, as Miss Bindschedler remarks, "immer schon vorhanden war, und welches durch Nachbildung, Umgestaltung und 'Neuschöpfung' nur verfälscht werden kann"; while the remaining chapters, "Die Rechtfertigung des Scheins," "Das Problem der Bildung," "Der Wille zur Macht," are devoted to a Nietzsche who justified and at times even glorified the creative lie in the name of

¹ Parenthetical statement is Miss Bindschedler's not my own.

life and of the "truth" inherent in the fiction-creating process. Miss Bindschedler's concluding remarks deal mainly with certain aspects of Nietzsche's impact upon contemporary philosophical and theological thought. Although her book is philosophical in approach and method, it should be of much interest also to the student of recent literature. Thus, for instance, Rilke's "Sag ihm die Dinge" is related in spirit to Nietzsche's will as a will to something, though, to be sure, it was Rilke's hope that he might succeed through the act of "saying" to undo the world which was produced by what Nietzsche called "eine ordnende, vereinfachende, fälschende, künstlich-trennende Macht in uns" and to recreate it poetically such as it might have been before the will willed "it" to "be."

University of California, Berkeley

ANDREW O. JASZI

Daniel C. von Lohenstein, *Türkische Trauerspiele*, ed. Klaus G. Just (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1953. xlvii + 267 pp. Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, 292). Daniel C. von Lohenstein, *Römische Trauerspiele*, ed. Klaus G. Just (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1955. xix + 317 pp. Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, 293). BEFORE us we have the first two volumes of Just's critical three-volume edition of Lohenstein's dramatic works. Volume I contains "Ibrahim Bassa" and "Ibrahim Sultan"; volume II, "Agrippina" and "Epicharis." Since 1817 or earlier, none of these plays has been reprinted, let alone edited; but with the appearance of volume III, expected soon, the entire dramatic output of Lohenstein will be available in reliable texts.

Just's introductory biographical sketch of the author is based on Johann von Lohenstein's short vita of his famous brother, but it is remarkable how much thoroughly enlightening material the editor has added. To mention only one item: to anyone interested in the cultural atmosphere of mid-century Silesia, news of the educational philosophy prevailing in Lohenstein's school, the Magdaleneum in Breslau, is highly welcome. Many other stimulating items could be mentioned. Of course, Just also gives a great deal of information on Lohenstein's friends and contemporaries and he uses wise restraint in doing so. Thus he is stimulating rather than exhaustive. If occasionally Just's own wording turns out rather baroque, the subject will excuse him. Just even has that rarest of editorial qualities, a sense

of humor (cf. vol. 293, p. 294, footnote). After a suggestive juxtaposition of T. E. Lawrence with Lohenstein we are inclined to overlook note 57 on p. xxxv of vol. 292, which sheds but a murky light on Jünger and none on Lohenstein.

The essay "Lohenstein und die türkische Welt" in the first volume is paralleled by "Lohenstein und die römische Welt" in the second; both are sound introductions to the plays that follow. By and large Just follows Ermatinger's lead in the interpretations of the plays, but he goes far beyond him by viewing Lohenstein in a European perspective that approaches Lunding's evaluation.

The bibliographical descriptions preceding each play maintain the exemplary standard of accuracy set by H. von Müller in the Hiersemann Festschrift *Werden und Wirken*, Leipzig, 1924.

In the treatment of the texts, Just has rejected the normalizations which a number of editors considered advantageous for some baroque writers. Since no Lohenstein manuscripts exist, the earliest printed versions were made the basis of the edition. Explanations of unusual words are sparingly provided and welcome, but I sharply disagree with Just when he writes: "Dass diese Lohenstein-Edition die Varianten sämtlicher Drucke würde bringen müssen, verstand sich von selber." Why? To print variants from editions on which Lohenstein himself could not possibly have had any influence is sheer folly unless a contribution to the history of printing and spelling is intended. But variants of printings as late as 1733 have been sedulously assembled and printed here. Moreover, despite a general disclaimer, scores of misprints are glossed as variants; original errata lists are reproduced and then each erratum is separately noted. Surely the reproduction of the original illustrations would help the modern reader, even the scholar, more than the egregious verbiage found at the bottom of the page.

But now, for all that, let me say and say emphatically that the edition under review is an excellent piece of work, one of which the Stuttgarter Literarische Verein has every right to be proud. Unfortunately I have it on best authority that the series will not be continued after this set is completed. If economies in production can help to reverse this decision, I suggest publication elsewhere of such valuable but ancillary material as the index "Lohensteins geistiges Weltbild" and the omission of all but the most indispensable variants in future volumes.

The University of Texas

G. SCHULZ-BEHREND

-
k
A

n
;
e
s
a
e
-

s
e
d
l
h
n
n
n
s
L
-
r,
e
e
n
e

e
e
-
d
o
e
"
e

F

ST

Wh
Sain
Gra
imp
of
rev
sop
me

IS

Wh
arr
led
cul

" I
tra
Sus

M

Ste
kn
fir
cri
cri
be
ar
Fr

T

W
de
to
th
cr
w

Four Benchmarks in Criticism

STUDIES IN HUMAN TIME

By Georges Poulet, translated by Elliott Coleman

When *Studies in Human Time* was published in France, it was awarded the Prix Sainte-Beuve, the Durchon Prize in Philosophy of the French Academy, and the Grand Prize of the Syndicate of Critics in Paris. Now, with the addition of an important new chapter on American authors, this brilliant and authoritative work of literary criticism has been translated for the English-speaking reader. French reviews were unstinting in their praise of this revolutionary method of philosophical criticism: "A masterwork." *La Croix*. "It could very well reshape the methods of literary criticism." *Le Soir*. 384 pages \$5.00

ISHMAEL. By James Baird

What, in our time, is the relationship between art and religious consciousness? To arrive at his answer, the author examines the work of some twenty recent writers—led by Melville—who created a system of symbols referring to the primitivistic cultures of the Orient as opposed to the Christian cultures of Western man.

"It is quite a brilliant piece of work, but brilliance is not really its most important trait. It is, I think, a profound book . . . a truly philosophical study of literature." *Susanne K. Langer*. 468 pages \$5.50

MALLARMÉ: Selected Prose Poems, Essays, and Letters

Translated with Introduction by Bradford Cook

Stephane Mallarmé, the leader of the French Symbolist movement, has been widely known and appreciated for his poetry in countries outside of France. Now, for the first time, it is possible for the English-speaking reader to have access to Mallarmé's critical writings on literature, music, theater, ballet, and individual artists. These critical writings include the most important, most original, and often the most beautiful pronouncements on art that French literature possesses. The translations are faithful to both the elegant style and the meaning of the extremely difficult French original. 200 pages \$4.00

THE ARTIST AS CREATOR. By Milton C. Nahm

What is the place of human freedom in the arts and fine arts? To what extent does the artist freely create, and to what extent is he a technician limited by his tools? These basic questions of aesthetics and the philosophy of art form the main theme of Professor Nahm's new book. In it he investigates the artistic process of creation, as opposed to the act of appreciation which he considered in his previous work, *Aesthetic Experience and its Presuppositions*. 364 pages \$5.50

THE *Johns Hopkins* PRESS



Baltimore 18,
Maryland

*New stories
for your
intermediate
students*



**D. C. HEATH
AND
COMPANY**

Sales Offices: Englewood, N. J.
Chicago 16 San Francisco 5
Atlanta 3 Dallas 1
Home Office: Boston 16

SANGRE EN EL UMBRAL

**BOOK EIGHT OF THE ALTERNATE
SERIES OF CASTILLO, BOND &
OTHERS'
GRADED SPANISH READERS**

18 titles so far in the *Graded Spanish Readers*—each planned to advance students by a definite step toward the reading of normal, unadapted Spanish. Available singly or five to a volume.

Sangre en el umbral contains two thrilling stories by Hugo Wast, edited by Carlos Castillo and Luis Leal.

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER

Modern Language Notes: regularly \$6.00) **BOTH**
ELH: regularly \$4.00) **for**
\$8.00

To receive both journals at a saving of \$2.00, simply send us your order with remittance of \$8.00.

Note: This offer limited to individuals
not available to libraries and other



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND